

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

State Funding of the Arts in England: An Assemblage in Action

Thesis

How to cite:

Wilson, Jane Margaret (2019). State Funding of the Arts in England: An Assemblage in Action. PhD thesis
The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2018 The Author

Version: Version of Record

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

State Funding of the Arts in England

An Assemblage in Action

By

Jane Wilson

A thesis submitted for the degree of PhD

Sociology, Open University

July 2018

Open University

State Funding of the Arts in England

An Assemblage in Action

The starting point for this thesis is the issue of measurement in cultural policy in England, why it has proved so difficult to measure value or demonstrate the impact of the arts in ways that meet the needs of government, and why it was that large-scale sample surveys were adopted in the early 2000s to address this issue.

Using a combination of Foucauldian and Actor Network Theory I argue that difficulties in measurement are built into a highly robust arts funding assemblage that developed in the late 1940s and 1950s. This assemblage has within it a particular, historically contingent, definition of culture, a definition developed out of the Romantic tradition and one which is highly resistant to measurement. I show how, during the formation of the assemblage, a series of stabilising institutional entities were brought into being, linking together art-form definitions, art-form specialist organisations, and the means by which state funding is distributed. The findings of an archaeological interrogation of the Taking Part Survey (set up to measure the impact of national government investment on cultural engagement) are used to inform an analysis of the Annual Reports and Accounts of the Arts Council of Great Britain (and its successor body Arts Council England) from 1945 through to the development of the survey. This analysis demonstrates how a particular definition of the arts and culture was embedded

and naturalised within the organisational structures of the Arts Council and then successfully carried forward into the sample survey. Finally, I argue that adopting a context specific, theoretically informed and historically contingent, managerial administrative approach to the definition of culture combined with the use of the technologies of big data, could open up more productive routes into measuring impact.

Jane Wilson July 2018

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors for their advice, patience and understanding over the too many years it has taken to get to submission. The timescale of my research was unexpectedly elongated by illness, both my own and that of family members. During that time, I changed my professional role and was able to start exploring the potential for different ways to measure and understand impact in that capacity. These gaps and changes of emphasis are visible in this thesis and are entirely my own responsibility. I would like to thank Richard, Flora and Ewan for their support and encouragement, and particularly my father, without whom I would not have completed this thesis.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	11
2. ARTS AND CULTURE: TWO HISTORIES	17
2.1 INTRODUCTION	17
2.2. REFLECTIONS ON THE HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT OF CULTURE IN THE UK	18
2.3 A BRIEF HISTORY OF CULTURAL STUDIES	25
2.4 CONCLUSION	31
3. SETTING OUT THE THEORETICAL LANDSCAPE	33
3.1 INTRODUCTION	33
3.2 BUILDING ON BOURDIEU: CULTURE AS A RELATIONAL OBJECT	34
3.3 DRAWING ON FOUCAULT: CULTURE AS CONCRETE AND SPECIFIC	38
3.4 ADDING IN ANT/STS: A ROUTE FOR RE-ASSEMBLING	49
3.5 THE SOCIAL LIFE OF METHODS	55
3.6 CONCLUSION	60
4. BRIDGING THE GAP - CULTURAL POLICY AND CULTURAL POLICY STUDIES	63
4.1 INTRODUCTION	63
4.2 DEFINING CULTURAL POLICY	63
4.3 DEBATES WITHIN CULTURAL POLICY STUDIES	65
4.4 CULTURAL ECONOMICS AND CULTURAL ECONOMY	71
4.5 CULTURAL POLICY STUDIES AND MEASURING IMPACT	78
4.6 CONCLUSION	88

5. REFINING THE PROBLEM	91
5.1 INTRODUCTION	91
5.2. THE TAKING PART SURVEY	91
5.3 THE ACTIVE PEOPLE SURVEY	104
5.4 CONCLUSION	108
6. THE CONDITIONS OF POSSIBILITY	111
6.1 INTRODUCTION	111
6.2 INCEPTION TO THE 1965 WHITE PAPER	114
6.3 THE FIRST ROYAL CHARTER OF THE ARTS COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN	118
6.4 THE ANNUAL REPORTS	119
6.5 ART FORM DEFINITIONS	120
6.6 FUNDING: COULD THERE EVER BE ENOUGH	130
6.7 ADOPTING THE ROLE OF PATRON	136
6.8 TO RAISE OR SPREAD, PART ONE: WHAT HAPPENS TO GEOGRAPHY	139
6.9 TO RAISE AND SPREAD, PART TWO: QUALITY AND STANDARDS	146
6.10 CREATING THE ART FORM ORGANISATION	149
6.11 POLICY WITHOUT 'A POLICY'	150
6.12 CONCLUSION	152
7. SUSTAINING THE ASSEMBLAGE	155
7.1 INTRODUCTION	155
7.2 THE WHITE PAPER AND BEYOND - INTO THE WHITE HEAT	155
7.3 THE ART-FORM, THE ART-FORM ORGANISATION AND THE PATRON	161

7.4 THE CHALLENGE TO STABILITY	165
7.5 CONCLUSION	182
<u>8. THROUGH THE TURN TO BUSINESS</u>	<u>185</u>
8.1 INTRODUCTION	185
8.2 THE GLORY OF THE GARDEN	185
8.3 MANAGING CHANGE	191
8.4 FROM FUNDING TO INVESTMENT	197
8.5 THE NATIONAL LOTTERY	203
8.6 WORKING WITH DATA	205
<u>9. NEW LABOUR AND A NEW ORTHODOXY</u>	<u>213</u>
9.1 INTRODUCTION	213
9.2 GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION	214
9.3 THE CHALLENGE OF DEMONSTRATING IMPACT	226
9.4 DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVIDENCE IN RELATION TO STATE FUNDING	232
9.5 HOW ABOUT THE ASSEMBLAGE?	240
9.6 CONCLUSION	242
<u>10. CONCLUSION</u>	<u>245</u>
<u>11. APPENDICES</u>	<u>265</u>
APPENDIX ONE: THE ROYAL CHARTERS	267
APPENDIX TWO: ANALYSIS OF THE TAKING PART SURVEY	269
APPENDIX FOUR: ARTS COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORTS AND ACCOUNTS	309

APPENDIX FIVE: EXTRACT FROM THE GLORY OF THE GARDEN	341
APPENDIX SIX: EXTRACT FROM COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING REVIEW 1998	343
APPENDIX SEVEN: THE OMNIBUS SURVEY QUESTION SETS	345
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	<u>419</u>

1. Introduction

“practices of policy-making cannot be divorced from the identities of policy makers and the society from which those policy makers are drawn”

(O’Brien, 2015, p.128)

In this introduction I set out why I was drawn to this topic, and why I have focused in on a detailed study, firstly of the sample surveys and then of the history of the Arts Council as evidenced through its own publications. I outline the key research concerns and questions and set out and explain the structure and content of my approach.

I am a part time researcher and spend the rest of my time working in the field of ‘subsidised’ arts policy and practice, as a senior cultural officer for a local authority. In other words, my place of work is a site in which cultural policy is enacted. My professional work is necessarily embedded within this thesis and I acknowledge both the limitations and the specific insights this provides.

I was drawn back to the academy to help me understand what might be termed as a crisis of UK arts policy: why couldn’t we consistently measure value or demonstrate impact in ways that met the needs of government, local and central? Was this because we were being asked, or chose to measure the wrong things? Or because we weren’t very good at measuring? Or maybe because we used the wrong tape measure? When I started down this road, it was an ongoing and frustrating ‘failure’ to demonstrate the value of publicly funded arts in terms that

worked outside the internal world of the sector itself, a situation it, at least in part, appeared willing to perpetuate by favouring a particular arts reality, one in which the arts are 'ineffable' and unmeasurable. More recently however, the failure to demonstrate impact on the part of publicly funded arts sector has translated into a struggle to maintain position and relevance within public policy, particularly within local government, as it is increasingly required to compete head to head with other priorities for public funds.

So, why had the state funded arts singularly failed to demonstrate the impact of their activity, despite a near universal acceptance within the sector of the 'power of the arts' to affect positive change? Why was the sector happy to live with the understanding of cultural practices so neatly summed up by Tony Bennett as: "ghostly, disembodied agents...being credited with the ability to perform heroic tasks: securing social cohesion, or bringing about civic renewal" (Bennett, 2007, p.32)?

The question that this thesis seeks to answer is one which emerged through the process of enquiry as outlined below: asking whether it was possible to conceptualise state funding of the arts in England as an assemblage in action, and if so, could a response to the conundrum posed by the ongoing failure to demonstrate the impact of state funded arts be found through a close study of that assemblage?

My starting point was the two large scale sample surveys, the Taking Part Survey and the Active People Survey, which in the mid to late 2000s, with seemingly little discussion, became a primary method by which the success or otherwise of government arts and cultural policy would be measured. I look in

detail at the surveys in Chapter Five.

Although the interest in the surveys was my chronological starting point, the structure is designed to present a meaningful route through the historical, theoretical and methodological context, before addressing the detailed empirical work, and then finally reaching a conclusion. This begins with Chapter Two which focuses on two histories, that of the concept culture, in particular as it pertains to the funded arts in England, and that of the development of cultural studies in England. In so doing I set the research problem out in more detail and raise the question of why it had not already been addressed through cultural studies. Chapter Three looks in more detail at the theoretical and methodological underpinning for the thesis, drawing firstly on Bourdieu and Foucault, and setting out how I will use Foucauldian archaeology and genealogy. It is these processes, incorporating a detailed study of material written records, and then working with the descriptions thus generated, that I apply in the empirical Chapters of this thesis. Chapter Three then demonstrates how I combine these Foucauldian methodologies with an ANT/STS understanding, in particular drawing on the work of John Law (Law 2004a, 2009, Law, Ruppert and Savage, 2011, Law and Ruppert 2013) in relation to the social life of methods and the triple lock. Chapter Four picks up the academic and applied strands of cultural policy studies, noting the particular relevance of cultural economy, and highlights literature relevant to the particular question of measuring the impact of publicly funded arts in England. Collectively, Chapters Two to Four set out the background to the empirical work, which starts in Chapter Five.

Chapter Five details the analysis of the Taking Part and Active People Surveys.

The focus of the analyses is not the data being produced by the surveys, but rather, following Law, the work being carried out by structure and framing of the surveys themselves, and the questions raised by that framing. The conclusion of Chapter Five highlights the set of themes which came out of those analyses and sets out the purpose of the next four Chapters, to explore the Arts Council as the route through which central state funding for the arts was distributed. The primary materials considered are the Annual Reports and Accounts of the Arts Council which provide a yearly snapshot of their interests, operating structure and funding decisions, combined with relevant policy documents and reports from both the Arts Council and government. Chapter Six considers the formation and early years of the Arts Council and argues that by 1965 a powerful triple lock (Law et al 2011) had developed, effectively sealing in a particular, historically contingent approach to state funding of the arts. Chapters Seven and Eight demonstrate how that triple lock comes through significant social, cultural and political upheaval, firstly through to 1984, and then again through to 1997 and the arrival of New Labour. The question of measurement as a policy requirement starts to emerge in Chapter Eight, and Chapter Nine looks in detail at the impact of the New Labour government on that requirement to measure, coming full circle to pick up the two sample surveys, which started in 2004 and 2008 respectively.

The conclusion in Chapter Ten answers the questions identified in the analysis of the sample surveys set out in Chapter Five and moves on to pick up the wider context beyond the surveys themselves. I consider how, in the light of both the theoretical position set out in the early Chapters, and the detailed analysis of the documentary evidence, it is possible to consider why the measurement of impact

has proved so difficult and address the research question as posed above: whether the conceptualisation of state funding of the arts in England as an assemblage in action has opened up a productive route for understanding and responding to the failure to demonstrate the impact of state funding for the arts.

Finally, returning back to my professional role, there is a coda to the thesis, which discusses the development of a project designed to test possible ways to support a better understanding of the impact of cultural engagement. The voice of the coda reflects my professional rather than my academic role, a voice with which I have wrestled in the construction of this thesis, and which needed to find a place in the final document.

2. Arts and Culture: Two Histories

2.1 Introduction

This Chapter sketches out the territorial background to the thesis, framed through two histories. The first addresses the definitional challenge presented by the word culture and the history of the concept of culture as it relates to publicly subsidised arts and culture in the UK. The second looks at the development of Cultural Studies as a distinct intellectual practice within the UK and starts to identify the key themes that will move forward across the thesis and into the empirical work.

Culture, of course, is a problematic word. Stuart Hall (1997) describes ‘culture’ as “one of the most difficult concepts in the human and social sciences” (p.2). Elsewhere he provides the following definition:

“By culture...we mean the actual grounded terrain of practices, representations, languages and customs of any specific society. We also mean the contradictory forms of common sense which have taken root in and helped to shape popular life” (1996, p.439).

Culture is a word with multiple uses, both overlapping and distinctive. In the context of this thesis, the challenge is further layered by the relationship between the word ‘culture’ and the word ‘arts’. ‘Arts’, ‘culture’ and ‘arts and

culture’ are often used more or less interchangeably in the policy context. This is demonstrated by its use in the title the Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), which describes itself thus on the front page of its website:

“the department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) helps drive growth, enrich lives and promote Britain abroad. We protect and promote our cultural and artistic heritage and help businesses and communities to grow by investing in innovation and highlighting Britain as a fantastic place to visit. We help to give the UK a unique advantage on the global stage, striving for economic success”
(<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-digital-culture-media-sport>)

Here, culture is standing in for both arts and heritage, with elements of economic development and tourism thrown in for good measure. Gray (2010) describes ‘culture as “an essentially contested concept’ (p.218) and highlights the importance of making explicit the definition in use, recognising how different definitions inflect the multiple fields claiming to study cultural policy. This tension is particularly problematic when working in an arena where both multiple definitions and multiple academic traditions are relevant and active, and as I work through the literature I will attempt to make it clear which version or versions of culture are in play.

2.2. Reflections on the history of the concept of culture in the UK

My first task is to reflect on the history of the concept of culture, and in particular its use and development in relation to ‘the arts’. In particular I consider the

tradition underpinning the concept of culture as it intersects with the initial steps to regularise state funding for the arts in the UK. This will help to position the thesis and introduce some of my key working themes. In this first section two themes come to the fore. The first draws on the work of Eleanora Belfiore and Oliver Bennett (2008), to articulate the sense that current cultural thinking does not recognise its own history, creating a form of cultural amnesia. The second focuses on the intellectual tradition which championed a particular understanding of culture, one which drew together Kantian aesthetics and the attribution of moral purpose to high quality art with the requirement for a corpus of heroic individuals tasked with maintaining that high quality art.

Belfiore and Bennett (2008) provide a broad ranging history of the “claims made over time for the value, function and impact of the arts” (p.vii). They do this through a comprehensive review of the different ways in which the impact of the arts has been and is now understood, going right back to Aristotle’s concept of catharsis. They provide a helpful frame to interrogate the history of the concept of culture, one which importantly reflects the contested positions ascribed to the arts, not all of which are positive. They argue that, although earlier contributors to the debate were clearly aware of and acknowledged this long history, by the mid-point of the twentieth century the visibility of this long tail dwindles significantly, within both theory and policy. This is the amnesia, or the forgetting, of the history of contested role and definition of the arts mentioned above. Belfiore and Bennett look specifically at the intellectual antecedents of arts policy in England, touching on the influence of the Enlightenment, the role of the Romantic Poets, and the work of Matthew Arnold. They draw on the work of

Saisselin (1970) to argue that the French Enlightenment brings forward the idea of “an explicitly civic slant to the case made for the civilising power of the arts” (p.127). This they contrast with the contemporary idea that the fine arts were an activity of the wealthy and privileged, used simply to fill in time. They argue that this shift created the space for a hierarchical approach to culture, with activities that were able to demonstrate public good seen as superior to those simple time-fillers. They quote Saisselin: “What they [the philosophes] wanted was great art, to be founded upon permanent values such as the true, the good, and the beautiful.” (1970, p.202, in Belfiore and Bennett, 2008, p.127). The reference to permanent values marks a crucial distinction between the idea of art and culture as a continuously changing entity, expressing a particular time and place (culture as a way of life), and culture as something that sits outside its spatial temporal context.

Belfiore and Bennett argue that this hierarchical process occurs in more than one place during the 18th Century and highlight *The Critique of Judgement* by Immanuel Kant (1790). In particular they note that for Kant, pleasure was not a sufficient response to art, but that there had to be a moral purpose. Art had a specific function to improve and civilise people through exposure to work of the correct quality. Belfiore and Bennett go on to suggest that the nineteenth century Romantic writers took this idea to its zenith.

They point to the work of Wordsworth, and his articulation of two ideas. The first that the pleasure to be derived from poetry is in some way elevated and should be both contrasted with and seen as ameliorative of the impact of modernity, which Wordsworth sees as blunting the “discriminating powers of the

mind” (Wordsworth, 1936, end 735, Belfiore and Bennett p.131). The second that the individual poet can take a heroic role in this process. Belfiore and Bennett argue that this view of the poet as the interpreter of eternal truth becomes highly influential both in England and beyond. Here, the purposeful version of culture, specifically in relation to poetry, becomes more defined, both in terms of the end goal, and the way in which it might be achieved. The idea of arts and culture as promoting eternity and permanence is brought to the fore, this time associated with the idea of an artist (the poet) as the heroic individual that enables the role of arts and culture to be fulfilled.

Upchurch (2016) provides further insight into the role of the Romanticism in setting the future direction of cultural policy, arguing for the importance of the concept of the clerisy, a term developed by Coleridge to hypothesise a form of secular clergy. Upchurch draws on the writings of Coleridge to describe the role of the clerisy thus: “The ‘whole order’ had an educational duty, ‘to preserve the stores and guard the treasures of past civilisation, and thus to bind the present with the past; to perfect and add to the same, and thus to connect the present with the future’ (Coleridge, 1839, p.47, in Upchurch 2016). Here the notion of the poet as interpreter of eternal truth is broadened out to a wider group of intellectuals. In addressing what it is that this clerisy would be upholding, Upchurch uses Raymond Williams’ work in *Culture and Society 1780-1950* (1958) to suggest that culture was taking the place of religion as the counteracting force to the values of industrialism and capitalism. This understanding of the role of culture links directly to the work of Matthew Arnold, in particular, *Anarchy and Culture* (1993).

Anarchy and Culture is a foundational text, arguably as much as a result of Arnold's success in promoting his work, as a reflection on its specific insight. Phrases such as "the best which has been thought and said" exemplify this capacity, and the importance of this verbal dexterity in the way in which Arnold's ideas came to hold such sway on cultural policy, alongside the associated risk of losing sight of any subtler understanding. Belfiore and Bennett argue that Arnold was to a large extent simply amplifying an already widely held view, developed through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that the arts had the capacity to civilise. Collini discusses the impact of Arnold's role and success as a social critic: "Arnold had the shrewd controversialist's eye for ways of gaining attention for his ideas, and a talent for condensing an argument into a catchphrase" (Arnold and Collini, 1993, p.xx).

Both O. Bennett (2005) and Collini argue that Arnold's capacity for a good turn of phrase led to subsequent interpretations of his work putting the emphasis in the wrong place, suggesting that it is these subsequent interpretations, rather than the work of Arnold himself, that have become particularly problematic. Bennett (2005) describes the tension between Arnold's role as a critic, where he is advocating 'the constant questioning of one's own position' (p.471), which Bennett sees as entirely compatible with contemporary approaches to cultural policy, and his recognition of cultural authority, his adherence to the belief that it is possible to know what is the 'best'. Collini addresses a similar point in his introduction to his 1993 edited volume of Arnold's essays when he highlights the way Arnold privileges thinking and writing. Collini goes on to argue that Arnold's concept of culture was not simply as an entity, but as a process; not a fixed body

of work but a benchmark.

The argument made by both Bennett and Collini is that the focus on the importance of an identified canon puts the emphasis in the wrong place. Certainly, Arnold did believe it was possible to identify the best and highlighted the role of critic as cultural authority; but to focus wholly on that one aspect of Arnold's thinking, they argue, loses sight of the idea of culture as process and the potential this opens up for change in relation to cultural practice.

The final concept to pick up from Arnold is his idea of 'aliens', which he describes as people with the capacity to move beyond their 'ordinary selves' and "govern in the interest of culture and the best self". Here again, the ideas of a group of people with particular, out of the ordinary, skills, whose role it is to safeguard culture. Upchurch (2016) argues that "Arnold's implication is that he and those with his degree of learning are intellectually and morally superior to the mass of his fellow citizens, both men and certainly women" (2016, Loc 1583).

Upchurch (2016) describes the relationship between Arnoldian thinking and Maynard Keynes (recognised as the founder of the Arts Council). She highlights how Keynes saw himself as part of an intellectual aristocracy, building his world view through contact with the philosopher G.E. Moore, the Apostles (a closed society at Kings College Cambridge of which Keynes was a member), and then through his lifelong association with the Bloomsbury Group, and his marriage to the Russian ballerina Lydia Lopokova. Upchurch reflects that Keynes' perspective on artists was very much in the mould of the heroic individual, with Keynes the economist adding in the need to shield the artist from market forces in order to be able to fulfil their role in relation to society. She quotes Keynes on

the artist and his (sic) relationship to society: “He needs economic security and enough income, and then to be left to himself, at the same time the servant of the public and his own master” (Keynes, 1982 vol XXVIII pp334-345, in Upchurch, 2016 loc 444). Upchurch shows how the turbulence of the first part of the twentieth century affected Keynes, again quoting Keynes:

“We were not aware that civilisation was a thin and precarious crust erected by the personality and the will of a very few, and only maintained by rules and conventions skilfully put across and guilefully preserved” (Keynes, 1949 pp 99-100, quoted in Upchurch, 2016, Loc 494).

Upchurch (2004) describes the impact on Keynes of his involvement with the Bloomsbury Group and their scepticism with state managed institutions at the same time as advocating for state funding of the arts, resolved by Keynes making “public support of private initiatives a cultural policy” (2004, p. 207).

Belfiore and Bennett also address the influence of Arnold on F.R. Leavis, arguing that in his essay *Mass Civilisation and Minority Culture* Leavis set out his position as the heir to Arnold. They suggest, however, that Leavis moves beyond Arnold by his placing of a literary education at the heart of true culture, and through his view that the proper understanding and capacity to identify the best literature could only ever be achieved by a minority, contrasting this with Arnold’s own idea that culture “is not satisfied until we all come to a perfect man; it knows that the sweetness and light of the few must be imperfect until the raw and unkindled masses of humanity are touched with sweetness and light” (Arnold, 1993 edn, 7-9, in Belfiore and Bennett, 2008, p.138). Belfiore and Bennett stress the huge influence Leavis has had on literary and cultural criticism post 1945 and

flag up the work of Roger Scruton among others to demonstrate that the Arnoldian perspective is still very much alive to the current day. They also point to the unintentional role Leavis had in the development of cultural studies, which they argue in no small part came about “as an attempt to counteract Leavis’ influential understanding of the literary canon and of cultural value.” (2008, p.139).

So far, I have sketched some of the ideas and concepts surrounding culture as expressed in the UK through to the mid 20th Century, focusing on those that relate to culture as understood within the bounds of ‘arts and culture’, highlighting the development of specific ways of understanding culture, in particular the Arnoldian idea of “the best which has been thought and said”, and the identification of the role of particular individuals in understanding and safeguarding this truth. The two themes which emerged were: Belfiore and Bennett’s cultural amnesia; and the very particular version of culture that held sway within UK intellectual circles in the 1940s. When I move into the empirical detail of my thesis I will draw on these themes to consider their impact on the way in which the Arts Council of Great Britain was established and developed.

2.3 A Brief History of Cultural Studies

I now take a side step to consider the development of Cultural Studies in the UK, highlighting some of the key theoretical moves which started in the first half of the 20th Century, but which did not have a visible impact on academic approaches to culture within the UK until the 1960s. There are numerous recountings of the history of Cultural Studies: Stuart Hall discusses it in a number of places including his 1983 series of lectures, published posthumously as

Cultural Studies 1983: A Theoretical History (Hall, ed. Slack and Grossberg, 2016); and texts such as *Cultural Studies Theory and Practice* (Barker and Jane, 2016), and *Cultural Studies, 50 Years On* (Connell and Hilton, 2016) provide their own versions. They all articulate the challenge of attempting to define cultural studies, summed up by Barker and Jane when they state, “Cultural studies does not speak with one voice, it cannot be spoken with one voice, and we do not have one voice with which to represent it” (2016, p.4). In that context, I do not intend to rehearse my own narrative in any detail, but instead pick up a couple of key moments in time and start to pick up key ideas and themes which will recur later. Two in particular stand out: the challenge of cultural studies to the idea of culture as purely artistic and aesthetic, and the way in which the focus of cultural studies on popular culture left the subsidised arts relatively untheorized.

Stuart Hall’s 1983 lectures provide a helpful route into the topic, starting with his description of the influence of Raymond Williams. Williams is positioned by Hall as the pivot point from the world of Leavis into the new and much more contested world of Cultural Studies. Hall argues that it is the rupture between Williams’ working-class Welsh upbringing and the understanding of culture that he encounters at the University of Cambridge, which underpins this role. It was simply not possible for Williams to buy into the Leavisite mission at the expense of his own cultural hinterland and it is this conflict that set him off down a highly influential, if flawed, trajectory into Cultural Studies. Williams continued to work within the Leavisite frame of the literary text, but even in doing so, he moved his analysis away from the purely artistic and aesthetic, into a social and cultural context. It is this attachment to the literary canon which made it impossible for

him to make the leap into studying the much broader forms of culture, as described in EP Thompson's *Making of the English Working Classes*.

This broader study was beginning to emerge at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham (CCCS), under its founding director Richard Hoggart. As Barker and Jane (2016, p.67) note, the move Williams made in starting to develop a route into understanding culture as part of an 'expressive totality' proved highly significant. The challenge to culture conceptualised and naturalised purely as artistic and aesthetic (with the previously discussed undertones of morality), is an important motif for this thesis, not because one is necessarily more correct than the other, but because it supports the idea of multiple arts realities. The founding of CCCS is widely identified as the key institutional moment for the UK tradition of Cultural Studies. From the outset it wrestled with the twin challenges of what later became known as Culturalism (building on the work of Raymond Williams, Richard Hoggart, and EP Thompson), and the reductive challenge presented by historical materialism and the Marxist base/superstructure apparatus which characterised culture as wholly determined by the economic base. Driven by its early economic focus, the work of CCCS turned to the analysis of popular culture, which has remained a major area of study for cultural studies.

This was an important corrective to the Leavisite view which had excluded pop and folk cultures from the cultural frame, however it left the theorising of the residual 'high' culture remarkably untouched. For example, Barker and Jane describe Cultural Studies as mainly "concerned with modern industrialised economies and media cultures organised along capitalist lines. Here

representations are produced by corporations that are driven by the profit motive” (2016, p.11). This description does not include artistic and cultural activity generated through public subsidy, which, to a large extent, appears to have been situated outside the core work of Cultural Studies. The ‘arts’ appear to have been left in the box marked artistic and aesthetic, and therefore not of interest to cultural studies.

The next key moment is what has become known as the cultural turn, when the impact of particular theoretical traditions, most notably structuralism, start to emerge in the UK. The relation with language could be considered foundational for contemporary cultural studies, with broad agreement that meaning is produced in and through language at some level.

In the simplest of terms, structuralism, following Ferdinand de Saussure’s posthumously published *Course in General Linguistics*, (1983) asserted that meaning did not reside in the word (or object) itself, but in the relation of the word (or object) to other words (or objects), and argued for a linguistic structure, with parole, (the act of speaking) a reflection of the underlying langue (the rules of speech). The importance of this shift to relationality as the primary route to meaning cannot over-estimated, and it has been particularly influential in cultural studies. Saussure himself was focused on linguistics and prioritised the synchronic nature of his approach, deliberately moving away from the historical version of linguistics which focused on origins and classification of individual words. However, this focus on structure at a single point in time left Saussure’s structuralism as a static entity, not able to incorporate change (see for example Hall, 1997, p.83). The stasis inherent in structuralism struggled to encompass

much of what matters to cultural studies.

Post-structuralism moved away from the idea of a static, fixed meaning, providing a much more effective linguistic model for cultural studies. Derrida, the French philosopher best known for the development of deconstruction (see for example Hill, 2007) critiqued structuralism and its privileging of speech over writing. He posited the concept of *différance*, where meaning is constantly deferred and shifted, both across time and across locations. This positioned language and languages as by definition multiple, with no one language ranked higher than any other. This concept of language is much closer to the contested concept of culture as discussed in the first part of this Chapter. Derrida's philosophy required that the interpretation of any text should be a careful and self-aware process, one which recognised the impossibility of moving away from singularities in the very attempt to do so. Inherent within Derrida's approach was a challenge to power, with the requirement of deconstruction to foreground those elements which are embedded within an idea or text, but which are hidden, lost, or sub-ordinated as a pre-condition of its existence. Although I do not take a specifically deconstructionist approach, the importance of collateral realities is picked up again in Chapter Three when I address the theoretical and methodological underpinning of the thesis.

Cultural studies as developed at CCCS drew heavily on the work of Gramsci to help manage the conceptual challenge presented by structuralism in relation to culturalism (see Hall, 1980), and their shared assumption that cultures were imposed upon subordinate classes (Hoare and Sperber, 2016, p.224). Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* (1971), also published posthumously, provided an

open-ended reflection on the relations between culture and politics, as well as a detailed discussion of the relationship between knowledge and power, summed up in the concept of hegemony. Hoare and Sperber argue that Gramsci centred his view of the relationship between culture and politics on the organisation of culture (2016, p.30). This placed his focus on the structures and processes of production and distribution. His refutation of the independent intellectual capable of pure thought (as discussed earlier in this Chapter) and at the same time of the economic determinism which placed culture as a mechanical reflection of economic forces, provided a new route to consider the role of culture from within a Marxist perspective. Gramsci's concept of hegemony foregrounded the role of culture in explaining how dominant social orders maintain themselves, and thus provided very fruitful ground for cultural studies in the UK, as exemplified by the work of Stuart Hall. The 'turn to Gramsci' (Hill, 2016, p.224) provided a way for cultural theorists to see popular culture itself as a place of struggle, rather than in simply oppositional terms as either the authentic voice of the people or as a vehicle for imposing the interests of the ruling classes.

The work of Habermas is also important to cultural studies, not least because of his opposition to the post-structuralist position, with his argument for a normative foundation for communicative action (1984). Whereas Gramsci's hegemony can be reconciled with the work of Derrida and Foucault (see below), Habermas' belief in a normative foundation is antithetical to post-structuralist thinking. This is a tension I return to in Chapter Four, when considering the different strands of cultural policy studies.

The final move I want to pick up in this section is one carried out by Foucault,

who moved beyond text to include a materialist position (Rabinow, 1984, p.10). As with the shift from structuralism to post-structuralism, which provided the space for managing multiplicity in language and text, Foucault's move to encompass practice within discourse provided a further hook into the study of culture. Foucault argued that discourse is not only language, but also practice, and that it should be studied through close empirical study of the surface, rather than recourse to arguments based on underlying, empirically invisible structures. Importantly Foucault argued that truth itself was contingent, and historically specific, existing in regimes of truth, a concept that has similarities to that of hegemony, albeit with a different approach to power, which Foucault saw as circulating and productive, rather than simply oppositional. His most famous histories explored this idea in relation to his specific areas of interest. For example, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1977) analyses the way in which the truth in relation to disciplinary society developed, and what was considered self-evident could be recast as a set of historical contingencies. This provides a very different way to conceptualise art and culture, one which opens up a space to reconsider the universal, moral definition set out earlier in this Chapter as a historically contingent practice, no less real for that contingency, but no longer to be reified as a transcendental entity. The work of Foucault is and has been hugely influential for cultural studies, and I return to consider his approach in more detail in the next Chapter to show how Foucauldian analyses are core to the work that takes place across this thesis.

2.4 Conclusion

This brings me to the end of Chapter Two, and with that, the development of an

emerging set of interleaving themes. I started by exploring the history of the concept of culture, and highlighting issues around cultural amnesia, the moral purpose of art, and the intellectual understanding of culture active in the UK, particularly within the community which championed the regularisation of state funding for the arts. The following section looked at the development of cultural studies and highlighted two interlinked themes which are important to this thesis: the challenge to culture as purely artistic and aesthetic, and the relative lack of theorisation in respect of state subsidised arts. Finally, I discussed the importance of the cultural turn (albeit that it layers on another use of the word cultural) and the development of new theoretical approaches that could be developed in relation to culture, to provide a context and backdrop that I will investigate further in my next Chapter, which focuses on the theoretical and methodological approach of this thesis.

3. Setting Out the Theoretical Landscape

3.1 Introduction

This Chapter sets out the theoretical and methodological landscape which underpins this thesis. It starts with a more detailed consideration of relevant positions within cultural studies, and then draws in ANT/STS to build the theoretical and methodological model for the empirical work which follows.

I start by introducing Bourdieu and his positioning of culture as a relational object, acting through the medium of cultural capital. This move away from transcendental, universal qualities sits broadly within the structural and post-structural thinking set out at the end of the last Chapter. However, I argue that although Bourdieu's approach identifies culture as a powerful social agent, it leaves the culture itself strangely passive. I then turn to Bennett et al (2009) to consider their updating of Bourdieu's cultural capital for early twenty-first century Britain, which moves the concept of cultural capital into a far more situated place but continues to leave the culture itself to one side.

Through a return to Foucault and a more detailed consideration of the potential of governmentality and subjectivity, I start to identify routes to take culture itself into concrete and specific locations and draw on Hunter's use of Foucauldian concepts to interrogate the practice of the aesthetic ethic to

demonstrate how this might work. I then follow Bennett as he builds on Hunter's approach and introduces Foucauldian materiality. I use Finnegan's *Hidden Musicians* as an example of culture as situated material practice, which introduces the challenge of the arts as a series of distinct, potentially over-lapping entities, with different and specific qualities in each location. I then return to Foucault, showing how a combination of Foucauldian methodologies and concepts opens up a space to manage this challenge.

The final section of the Chapter turns to Actor Network Theory (ANT) to round out and develop that Foucauldian space and identify possible tools to re-assemble subsidised arts as a specific, concrete and situated material practice. The section starts with a brief introduction to ANT and then moves into a discussion of the potential of the assemblage, and its operation on a single working surface, drawing in Law's conception of the romantic versus the baroque to consider how to manage complexity within that single plane. I follow Law again in a discussion of the social life of methods, bringing the focus in to address the question of measurement and touch on the work of Desrosieres to provide an example of a genealogical approach to method. Finally, I identify the concept of the triple lock as a potential mechanism through which to interrogate the challenge of measurement in relation to the subsidised arts in England.

3.2 Building on Bourdieu: Culture as a relational object

Bourdieu's foundational text *Distinction*, an empirical study of French culture, is considered a key sociological study of the twentieth century. It introduced the concept of cultural capital, arguing that an education in high culture endowed its recipients with advantages over those who had not received it, not because of

any inherent quality embedded within the cultural activity, but rather because of the relational capacity it provided. Bourdieu argued that the worlds of art and music were not transcendental, but were in fact social agents, and served to legitimise and reproduce class distinctions. However, Bourdieu's culture (in the narrow sense of a series of specific experiences involving music, visual art, literature etc.) appears to be at the same time both very powerful and curiously passive. Culture, through the concept of cultural capital, is very much implicated in the construction and maintenance of the social, but there is little or no discussion of the way in which the social is implicated in the construction of culture, or any exploration of the reflexive relationship between the two. Culture is an object to be acquired and used (Bourdieu, 1986, p.2).

There does appear to be a space in which to explore the relationship between the social and culture by following Bourdieu's argument that the 'pure gaze' was not a natural phenomenon, but rather a construction linked to the development of his autonomous fields of production (1986, p.3). He defines a field as: "capable of imposing its own norms on both the production and the consumption of its products" (p.3), a process through which the entity and the systems for recognising or validating the entity are co-produced, and which could therefore provide the basis for a theorisation of the subsidised arts. Bourdieu's concept of a pure gaze gives primacy to the mode of representation, rather than to any possible object of representation, and he argued that the working-class expectation that art should represent something else prevented them from developing a 'pure gaze'. This position, which ties the 'working-class' to a particular cultural point of view through their lack of a 'pure gaze', is summed up

in the statements that popular taste chooses music “devalued by popularisation” and “especially songs totally devoid of artistic ambition or pretension” (1986, p1.6). Here Bourdieu appears to revert back to a more straightforwardly post-Kantian view of aesthetics and culture. He is using his own situated taste to specify the relation between a particular set of social and cultural entities, rather than recognising and further exploring the potential for ‘mutual self-vindication’. Thus, Bourdieu points the way, but eventually remains unable to recognise his own embedded perspective.

Bourdieu is making two separate statements about culture: firstly, that different classes appropriate culture in different ways (with culture understood as a static object), and that those differences create cultural capital, used to help define and maintain class distinction; and secondly that the “pure gaze” reception of culture is inextricably linked to the development of autonomous art fields. He links these together by an assumption that reception using a “pure gaze” is attached to specific classes. What he does not do is make any claims for the immanence of culture, or any immanent value attached to the different ways of receiving culture. Although Bourdieu finds it impossible to extricate himself from the position that high culture is ‘better’ than popular culture, he does not suggest that it is the culture itself that provides cultural capital, rather that the capital is gained entirely from the relationship between different social groups and the types of culture they have appropriated.

Bourdieu’s lack of engagement with the cultural part of the relationship between culture and the social could be seen simply as a reflection of his intellectual focus, and it is absolutely the case that *Distinction* opened up a fruitful

line of exploration in drawing attention to the relationship itself. However, I would argue that by not engaging more directly with the way in which culture is constituted, Bourdieu failed to heed his own analysis to study the relationship itself, leaving open the door for reductive readings of his work as a straightforward addition to the idea of culture as improvement, with engagement with particular forms of culture providing that improvement.

Culture, Class, Distinction by Bennett et al (2009), systematically assesses the way in which Bourdieu's account can be applied to Britain, through developing, updating and applying the work of *Distinction* to a large-scale study of participation in culture in the UK. The study asks three questions: the first assessing whether they can detect cultural capital in contemporary Britain, the second whether different cultural fields are structured along similar lines, and the third to what extent they can see in the organisation of cultural forms processes which advantage middle-class groups (p.14).

Their first conclusion is that Bourdieu's proposition of the existence of systematic patterns of cultural taste and practice is clearly upheld by the findings of their study, supporting Bourdieu's core argument about the existence of a relationship between culture and the social. However, they also argue that the cultural context in contemporary Britain is very different to that of the France of Bourdieu and suggest that Bourdieu's version of cultural capital needs to be refined and developed.

For Bennett et al a "more elaborate and better specified analysis of capitals, or assets, is required to account for the diverse ways that cultural practice delivers profits to individuals and groups" (p.259), and they point to far more

complex patterns than those articulated by Bourdieu. There is not a simple correlation between cultural taste and class distinctions, with age and gender also strongly implicated in the patterning of cultural practice, and the policing of the boundaries of legitimate culture now much weaker (p.255).

In relation to cultural capital Bennett et al make the point that Bourdieu's relatively straightforward indicators: "command of legitimate culture and mastery of the Kantian aesthetic" (p.256), do not hold for Britain in 2003, where effective demonstration of cultural capital is seen as far more complex. However, they also argue that the idea of cultural capital can be rehabilitated through more detailed analysis, recognising the increasingly diverse ways in which the benefits of cultural practice are recognised (p.259).

This updated application of Bourdieu's work offers a far more nuanced picture of the kinds of engagement people in early 21st century Britain have with culture and flags up the challenge presented by the Kantian aesthetic. Bennett et al make the move away from an ahistorical universal version of cultural capital, to something far more concrete and situated. However, as with Bourdieu, their focus is on culture as a social agent, with the culture itself left to one side, at the same time both a powerful actor and a curiously static entity. Although their approach opens up new possibilities for culture as an actor, it does not provide new insight into the way in which the social acts back onto culture. In order to find a route to explore the challenge of culture as a historically contingent practice, I now return to Foucault, first introduced in relation to the cultural turn.

3.3 Drawing on Foucault: Culture as concrete and specific

Although Foucault's own work does not to any significant extent touch on the

narrow definition of culture used in this thesis, it has been highly influential within cultural studies. There is a hint of the 'arts' within the *Archaeology of Knowledge* (2002) when Foucault considered archaeologies beyond those of science and sketched the potential for an archaeology of painting. Here he suggested that painting could be considered as a discursive practice, embodied in the techniques, practices and gestures of the painter, arguing that "the painting is not a pure vision that must then be transcribed into the materiality of space; nor is it a naked gesture whose silent and eternally empty meanings must be freed from subsequent interpretations" (2002, p.213-4).

Sadly, Foucault did not pursue this suggestion himself, and the adoption of Foucauldian approaches within cultural studies appear to have followed the familiar route of focusing on the social. This is very well summarized by Tony Bennett's (2003, p.53) discussion of Rose's difficulty with culture in a Foucauldian context: that an amorphous, ahistorical, always and everywhere definition of culture does not provide sufficient purchase for understanding how relations between culture and the social are constituted. Bennett argued that the introduction of Foucault's governmentality into cultural studies led to very productive work on the 'social' side of the equation but left the 'culture' side untouched. He suggested that the introduction of semiotics into the equation had only provided a further route for characterising culture as an 'always and everywhere' set of relations. A more helpful way forward would be to consider neither culture nor the social as a constant.

Foucauldian governmentality, with its focus on mechanisms, ways of acting and seeing, and specific vocabularies should have provided a helpful way into

investigating the processes of cultural policy. The Foucauldian scholar Mitchell Dean (1999) defines governmentality as “any more or less calculated and rational activity undertaken by a multiplicity of authorities and agencies, employing a variety of techniques and forms of knowledge, that seeks to shape conduct by working through our desires, aspirations, interests and beliefs, for definite but shifting ends and with a diverse set of relatively unpredictable consequences, effects and outcomes” (Dean, 1999, p.11). However, Bennett (2003) argues that the take-up of governmentality within cultural studies had not led to “any major revision of the concept of culture on the part of those working at the interfaces of questions of culture and government.” (p.48). The invisibility of Foucauldian concepts within the cultural policy literature relevant to the subsidised arts is a further example of the essentialisation of ‘the arts’, black boxing the aesthetic and preventing consideration of the mutuality of interaction between culture and the social. Recent studies situated within the cultural economy tradition are now challenging this position, and I draw on those examples in the next Chapter.

The second Foucauldian concept relevant here is subjectification. Rose argues:

“Subjectification is not to be understood by locating it in a universe of meaning or an interactional context of narratives, but in a complex of apparatuses, practices, machinations, and assemblages within which human being has been fabricated, and which presuppose and enjoin particular relations with ourselves” (Rose, p.10, 1998)

Bennett argues that this is entirely compatible with a governmental conception

of culture, comparing it with Foucault's statement on discursive practices: "They take shape in technical ensembles, in institutions, in behavioural schemes, in types of transmission and dissemination, in pedagogical forms that both impose and maintain them" (Foucault 1997, p.12). This is very far from the generalizing 'always and everywhere' view of culture, and Bennett (2003) expands on this. His description of culture is worth quoting at length, because it starts to demonstrate how different arts realities could exist:

"particular forms of expertise arising out of distinctive regimes of truth that assume a range of practical and technical forms through the variety of programs for regulating "the conduct of conduct" that they are, or have been, attached to. The expertise of the literary critic within literature's distinctive regimes of truth; of the art gallery and museum curator; of the community arts worker... these are all forms of expertise subjected to particular forms of validation and translated into particular technical forms through their inscription within particular technical apparatuses." (2003, p.56).

Here Bennett is recognising the existence of different arts realities, each with their own particular set of practices. Although this might seem self-evident, it opens up a very specific space for interrogating the practices of 'the arts' at the point they start to receive state funding, which is a very particular form of the social acting back onto culture.

Bennett suggests four possible directions for further exploration: firstly, that the aim should be to work with the particular and the concrete; secondly that the relationships between culture and the social are historically specific, and neither

side should be regarded as constant; thirdly that culture can be understood as a Foucauldian discourse, representing culture as a distinctive set of knowledges, expertise, techniques, and apparatuses (2003, p.60); and finally that Rose's interpretation of Foucault's subjectification provides a mechanism for resistance and agency, with the contradictory effects of movement across different practices giving "rise to specific forms of agency - not agency in general" (2003, p.61). Bennett's arguments for the productive role of Foucauldian concepts in the study of cultural policy appear to provide a specific and potentially fruitful route for the exploration of the relationship between 'the arts', state funding of 'the arts' and the impact of the practices that are being carried out.

Ian Hunter's paper *Aesthetics and Cultural Studies* (1992) approaches aesthetics as a technology of the self and is a good example of the use of Foucauldian concepts to open up the study of the subsidised arts. Hunter describes aesthetics as a 'practice of the self', situating it as a historically contingent activity, and contrasting this with what he describes as the more standard Cultural Studies practice of viewing aesthetics as either an artificial split from the wider social and economic sphere, or as a minority pastime. Hunter draws directly on Foucault's work on sexuality, in particular his studies of early Christian sexual ethics, and his positioning of the ethical domain as consisting of technologies for problematising conduct in such a way that enables individuals to become the subjects of their actions. Hunter applies this formulation to aesthetics, describing the aesthetic as a "distinctive way of actually conducting one's life - as a self-supporting ensemble of techniques and practices for problematising conduct and events and bringing oneself into being as a subject

of an aesthetic existence” (p.348). Hunter describes the practice of the aesthetic ethic, starting with the positioning of a work of art as “a device for self-problematisation”, one which brings with it a “situated incomprehensibility”. This incomprehensibility is crucial to the practice of aesthetics, which Hunter describes specifically in relation to the literary tradition, describing the process of practical criticism as a practice for “shaping a distinctively aesthetic self” (p.353), a process which can never be completed. This helpfully calls back to the earlier section on the history of the concept of culture in the UK and provides further insight into the way in which the version of culture embedded within the funded arts, which drew heavily on the literary tradition, came into being. Hunter highlights the concept of *Bildung* as an example of an aesthetic technology of the self, arguing that the goal of the aesthetic ethos is a state of permanent ethical preparation, withdrawn from the world of mundane knowledge and action: the aesthetic ethos aims at an un-knowable state of being.

The importance of this analysis is three-fold. Firstly, it situates aesthetics as a historically contingent practice, one which is closely tied to the description of the history of the concept of culture earlier in this Chapter. Secondly it foregrounds the particular nature of the practice as placed in the interaction between the subject and the work of art, rather than in participation in the creative process itself. This point will become very important in the empirical analysis when asking why attendance and viewing of ‘the arts’ was considered a valid route for measuring impact. Finally, the description of the practice as one of infinite deferral, of sitting outside the knowable world, provides a further crucial insight into the question of measurement. The implication is that the practice is

unknowable, or in other words, inherently unmeasurable.

Hunter's approach has been both critiqued and developed by Bennett (2011, 2014) through Bennett's own lens as a cultural studies practitioner. He states that Hunter "historicises and relativises the forms of moral and epistemological authority that informed the early development of British cultural studies precisely by demonstrating its affiliations with the governmental technologies that post-Kantian conceptions of culture had come to be tangled up with" (2014, p.86). However, Bennett argues that Hunter's focus on the literary disciplines has allowed him to create an overly simplified picture and, following Foucault, identifies material forces and the understanding of their role in shaping human conduct and relations, as a major driver of change in the humanities. Bennett (2011) develops the idea of post-Kantian aesthetics as a Foucauldian technology of the self, neatly describing how aesthetics "as a practice of freedom has been developed in the slipstream of... Kant's account of the beautiful". He argues that this ignores the very limits imposed by the technologies of the aesthetic self, which require the imposition of very particular kinds of authority. Importantly Bennett characterises the authorities of the aesthetic self as inherently set against the authorities of measurement associated with empirical disciplines, which makes it impossible to measure the impact of encounters between members of the public and works of art. Here Bennett is furthering the point first made above, and reinforcing its critical importance for this thesis, by identifying one of a number of reasons why measurement of the impact of the arts has proved so difficult to achieve. By definition, aesthetic engagement is not a measurable experience. This impossibility was built in to the historically contingent reality of 'the arts' put in place when state funding of 'the arts' was

initiated, through the intellectual tradition which underpinned that moment. Crucially this does not mean that other possible 'arts' realities are unknowable or unmeasurable, but only the particular reality which includes within it the aesthetic ethic.

Bennett then advocates for the study of the relations between culture and the social at a concrete, situated level. The key move he makes is to describe the relationship between culture and the social as a reflexive one: "It is, then, these two aspects of the work of culture – the work of making it, and the work it does – that I think need to be placed at the centre of any programme for the analysis of the relations between culture and the social" (Bennett, 2007, p.33). He is making the point that culture is made, that it does not exist separately to the social, but is a situated phenomenon, requiring constant making itself, and that this is as important to any understanding of the relationship between the social and culture, as the work it then does. Culture seen in this way is not ahistorical, amorphous, or immanent, but becomes amenable to investigation.

Bennett (2007) goes on to argue that the work of making culture is mainly carried out by institutions. There is a risk with this argument that 'immanence' is simply moved from culture to the institution. Although institutions are very likely to form an important part of the process of bestowing 'culturalness', it should not be a given, as they themselves come into being through processes of ordering. The mechanisms through which institutions develop play a critical part in the process of providing a concrete shape to culture, and I explore this further in the empirical section of this thesis.

Finnegan's *Hidden Musicians* (2007) points the way to the kind of study that

could meet Bennett's requirements, at the same time as addressing the importance of institutional formation. The following statement from Finnegan's introduction illustrates this:

"Many of our valued institutions are pictured as just floating on invisibly and without effort. On the contrary, as it will become clear, a great deal of work and commitment have to be put into their continuance: they do not just 'happen' naturally. Local music, furthermore - the kind of activity so often omitted in many approaches to urban study - turns out to be neither formless nor, as we might suppose, just the product of individual endeavour, but to be structured according to a series of cultural conventions and organised practices...in which both social continuity *and* individual choices play a part." (2007, p.10).

Here Finnegan is talking about the work people do to make and hold together their own musical worlds, drawing on existing hinterlands, manipulating and adding to them. This perspective, working across a range of genres (she explores classical, jazz, brass band, musical theatre, country and western, and rock and pop 'worlds') enables her to suggest that "music is neither something self-evidently *there* in the natural world nor fully defined in the musical practices of any one group; rather what is heard as 'music' is characterized not by its formal properties but by people's view of it, by the special frame drawn around particular forms of sound and their overt social enactment." (p.7). This is remarkably similar to Bennett's description of a cultural assemblage: it is the assemblage, not the materials from which it is assembled, which distinguish one from another. Again, this provides fruitful ground in relation to approaching the question under

consideration, suggesting that culture can be understood not as a powerful but passive object, but rather as a set of relations which need work to maintain their integrity.

If, as Finnegan (2007) points out, a 'single' art form such as music, can be seen as made up of endless different 'musics', each assembled out of different individual and collective actions, histories, materialities, is it possible or even appropriate to think about the arts as a single entity at all? And yet, 'the arts' definitely does exist as a concrete entity within UK government policy and current performance measurement tools. On the one hand therefore, it appears that the 'arts' as people experience and use them do not exist as a single entity, but on the other government 'arts' policy is, as is suggested by the name, predicated on the existence of that form. How can I work with this inconsistency without arriving back at the same place as I started? Or, to put it another way, is it really impossible to carry out an empirical, measurement of the way in which arts and the social interact, if the entity 'arts' does not exist at the point where that interaction takes place?

Again, Foucault provides possible routes and concepts for managing this complexity, by directing attention to the detail of how actions are carried out. My empirical Chapters draw on both Foucauldian archaeology and genealogy. Foucault's archaeology, described as "the analysis of the statement as it occurs in the archive" (Kendall and Wickham, p.24), looks for the ways in which statements condition visibilities and vice versa; how statements perform what can be seen, how what can be seen then forms what statements can be made, and therefore how they are mutually performed into being. Genealogy, which

Foucault describes as “grey, meticulous and patiently documentary (Foucault, 1984, p.76), is often described as a history of the present, an alternative to the more traditional teleological conception of history with a necessary endpoint. Working with the two processes together maintains the focus on a detailed analysis of the archive and introduces the potential to ask how that analysis can problematise and inform the present. Dean (1994, p.33) articulates the relationship between genealogy and archaeology as complementary, with “the latter performing analyses that are a necessary condition of the former”. Dean quotes Foucault:

“If we were to characterise it in two terms...archaeology would be the appropriate methodology of this analysis of local discursivities, and genealogy would be the tactics whereby, on the basis of the descriptions of these local discursivities, the subjected knowledges thus released would be brought into play” (ibid, p.33).

The particular points to draw here are firstly the archaeological focus on the archive; and secondly how a process of detailed investigation can provide the material necessary for a genealogical study of a developing ‘regime of truth’.

Finally, I draw attention to Foucault’s concept of eventalisation, which he describes as “rediscovering the connections, encounters, supports, blockages, plays of forces, strategies and so on which at a given moment establish what subsequently counts as being self-evident, universal and necessary” (Foucault, 1981, p.6). Here Foucault is drawing particular attention to contingency and the vital importance of recognising the accidental and coincidental in the creation of any historical narrative, as a corrective to the naturalising processes of more

traditional histories. Foucault's definition of eventalisation provides a practical route to understanding how he conceptualised the development of 'regimes of truth', and therefore the kinds of actions to look for and follow through the archaeological process.

3.4 Adding in ANT/STS: a route for re-assembling

Actor Network Theory (ANT) developed within the field of Science and Technology Studies (STS) in the 1980s, driven by the work of Bruno Latour, Michel Callon, John Law, Anne Marie Mol and others (see for example, Latour 1987, 2005, Callon 1986, Law and Hassard 1999, Mol and Law 2002).

One way of understanding STS is as a version of the cultural turn within the sociology of science. At its simplest, it is the request that science, technology and the social are all seen as interlinked and dynamic assemblages, rather than any one part being taken as static or foundational. As such it sits broadly within the field of material semiotics, as discussed previously a location taken up and championed by Foucault. Actor Network Theory (ANT) has taken the principles and approach of STS into locations not considered traditionally 'science and technology' and has been championed within cultural studies by writers such as Tony Bennett. As with cultural studies itself, ANT/STS does not set out to be a single cohesive theory, but rather a set of principles about the processes for looking at and studying practice.

Before moving into the detailed work of this chapter, it is worth a quick visit to the work of Latour and others for a brief introduction to ANT/STS. *Laboratory Life* (1979, Latour and Woolgar), which can be considered one of the foundational texts for the field, was the outcome of an ethnographic study of a science

laboratory (the Salk Institute). What Latour recognised through the ethnography was the messiness of practice, and the relationship between the construction of scientific knowledge and those messy knowledge practices. These practices stretch far beyond the scientists themselves, incorporating scientific instruments, buildings, institutions, technologies, texts, laws, and so on. Latour argued that the particular version of scientific knowledge that emerges is dependent on the relations between all of these different actors, human and non-human alike. Law's 2004 text *After Method, mess in social science*, sets out the learning from that initial study by Latour and Woolgar and its implications for ANT. Law addresses the notion of the inscription device, described as "a system (often including, but not reducible to, a machine) for producing inscriptions, or traces, out of materials that take other forms" (p.20). In the subsequent uses of those traces, what the ethnography demonstrated was that although the materiality of the processes for producing them was lost, the specificity of the traces was entirely dependent on the system which produced them. In other words, "particular realities are constructed by particular inscription devices and practices (p.21). Law is careful to elaborate that this does not mean that any particular reality is not real, or that it would be possible to create any version of reality, but rather any accepted reality it is only one of potentially many realities that could and do exist. The mechanisms by which particular realities take hold and become adopted is a key question for ANT. When considering this, Law asks us to consider five points in relation to reality: out-there-ness, independence, anteriority, definiteness and singularity: can a specific reality exist, be the same everywhere and have a definitive shape, prior to and independent of any apparatus that produces reports of that reality? ANT suggests that specific concrete realities do not exist separately to the

apparatus that reports them, rather that the realities and their apparatuses are co-produced. In translating this theoretical position to a practical application, it is important to recognise that ANT recognises what is described as a hinterland: an ongoing backdrop of stabilised and stabilising knowledge practices and associated realities, into which any new realities need to fit. This hinterland is critical to which realities are able to stabilise themselves: knowledge practices which struggle to situate themselves effectively in relation to their hinterland are not likely to become accepted as realities. As I now move into the detail of this chapter I will demonstrate the role ANT/STS will play in the theoretical and methodological approach used in the empirical chapters of this thesis.

Earlier in this Chapter I explored the way in which Bennett recruited Foucauldian governmentality to help set a direction for a more fruitful understanding of the reciprocal relationship between the social and culture, and the concrete ways in which culture is brought into being. As I set out how I intend to add ANT/STS into the theoretical and methodological landscape of this thesis, I return to Bennett and show how he builds the link forwards into the work of Latour and the potential of an ANT/STS approach.

Latour (2005) describes the social as “not a special domain, a specific realm, or a particular sort of thing, but only as very peculiar movement of re-association and re-assembling” (p.7). Bennett (2007) applies this description to culture, arguing that to take this route means moving away from the idea of culture and the social as “different realms made up of different kinds of things (representations, say, versus material social relations” (p.34). Bennett suggests that the difference between the social and culture is not ontological, but is to be

found in their specific, concrete assemblages: “They are distinguished from one another as different public organizations of things, texts and humans that are able to operate on and in relation to each other through the differences that have thus been historically produced from them” (p.34). In other words, culture is made through particular assemblages. This enables Bennett to argue that, as with the social, as the concrete processes of making culture continue, culture simultaneously ‘acts’ back onto the social, on what Bennett calls a ‘working surface’. Bennett goes on to draw on the work of Latour to argue that as with the social, it is also possible to say that there are not separate macro and micro levels of operation for culture: the macro exists only through the actions of the micro, with both therefore existing on the same plane. Latour’s description of the relationship between macro and micro is very helpful, again starting to shape the way in which the investigation of concrete activity might proceed:

“Macro no longer describes a *wider* or a *larger* site in which the micro would be embedded like some Russian Matryoshka doll, but another, equally local, equally micro place, which is *connected* to many other through some medium transporting specific types of traces. No place can be said to be bigger than any other place, but some can be said to benefit from far safer connections with many *more* places than others.” (2007, p.176)

Bennett takes this further by following Law to suggest that it might be more productive to view the processes and mechanisms implicated in making culture as part of a method assemblage. I quote the following passage from Bennett at length, as it starts to get to the detail of what a method assemblage in this realm

might look like:

“The nexus of relations between community art, the institutions in which this is produced, stored and accumulated, the forms of expertise that are involved in its production and dissemination, the ways in which both these and community art practices are enrolled in governmental programmes aimed at, variously, including excluded communities, building up community identity as an interface between the political system and the individual, and the ways in which such initiatives call on sociological accounts of community and the role of social capital in its formation and maintenance: all of these are pointers to the form that such analysis might take.” (2007, p.37).

Bennett is making the case for culture as a set of concrete, material practices, well beyond the boundaries of the aesthetic field, operating on a working surface on which both micro and macro can be traced, and which can be understood through an analysis of those practices. This is a decisive move away both from the idea of culture as an amorphous ‘always and everywhere’ phenomenon, and of culture as a purely aesthetic practice.

Building on the notion that the micro and macro both exist on the same working surface and returning to the question posed towards the end of the last section: how to manage the concept ‘arts’ in relation to measuring interactions which are not ‘arts’ but much more specific and concrete; Law’s 2004 discussion of romantic versus baroque enactments provides a useful example of how to manage complexity on a single plane. Law characterizes the romantic as a “looking up and centring”, arguing that this romantic formalism enacts a strong

pull towards abstraction and away from the specific, whereas the baroque in contrast looks down and in, working with the specific and concrete. This is not the same as the micro/macro divide, as it operates on the same working surface with the distinction based on the way in which the materials are assembled. Law's (2004) description of an inscription device opens the way to consider this process of looking up and centring as a particular form of inscription device: the assemblage comes together through the process of looking and centring, and once drawn together, subsumes the detail contained within it. Law's work on statistical survey data (2009) is useful to illustrate this point. Law analyses the Eurobarometer survey of consumer practices to explore how statistical processes, which usually fade into the hinterland, perform particular versions of the real. He argues that these realities are valid, but "only in highly specific places": the Eurobarometer reality exists "but only in the context of its own interviews". Here, realities are performative, and Law suggests that their validity in part comes from creating knowledge that works, and realities which are a good fit for that knowledge.

These concepts build on the Foucauldian route-map for empirical work, providing a way to place the abstract 'arts' entity into a working relationship with the concrete and the specific: the 'arts' does exist as an entity within the context of the policies which call it into being, and within the policy discussions, documents, and institutions which form its hinterland. These are concrete and specific places, but they are not the same places as those described earlier in the work of Finnegan, and in each of these places, the entity takes on a slightly different form.

This provides a space to consider ‘the arts’ as existing as a concrete entity at the policy level, but not existing at the place in which creative practice takes place. The construct of ‘the arts’ loses, or hides, the non-coherence that would be enacted and made explicit through a baroque perspective. This provides new way to approach the use of statistics within UK arts policy, as a process of ‘looking up and centring’, creating an abstract entity that disappears at the sites of the specific and concrete activities it is attempting to measure. In other words, ‘the arts’ is an entity, and it has a fractional relationship with creative practices, but is not the same.

This delivers a further route into the investigation of my question, by starting to identify a particular place within the archive to carry out the archaeological and genealogical analysis outlined earlier, that is, the place in which state funding is a part of the assemblage that ceates a particular reality of ‘the arts’ as a funded entity, Here it might be possible to see the process of looking up and centring in action, and therefore be able to foreground and problematise the specific, concrete creative practices fractionally contained within it.

3.5 The Social Life of Methods

The social life of methods, that methods are both constituted by and performative of the social, as set out by Law (2004), Law and Urry (2004), and Law, Ruppert, and Savage (2011), is the final part of the theoretical jigsaw underpinning my empirical investigation. This idea of mutual performance into being recalls the description of Foucauldian archaeology and is one of the many points of contact between the Foucauldian and ANT/STS approaches I combine in this thesis. Bringing in the social life of methods to work alongside the archaeological

analysis attends in particular to the question as to why it has been so difficult to develop effective methods of measurement.

The starting point for the social life of methods is the proposition that methods do not develop in a vacuum, that they don't exist separately of the purposes they are intended to meet. Desrosieres' (1998) discussion of the history of statistical reasoning is a pertinent example for this thesis. Desrosieres shows how methods required advocates and patrons in order to gain first purchase and then stability. Methods therefore have history, genealogies of their own. They are constituted by the social and exist as part of method assemblages. Equally, and usefully in this context, as Law et al say, "Despite considerable investment, some methods fail to produce hoped-for results" (2011, p.4).

The second step follows logically: if methods are constituted by the social their actions are also performative of the social. Returning to Desrosieres, he demonstrates how the development of statistics included the creation of the standardised entities which are an essential part of moving away from the singular and towards the commensurability needed for statistical reasoning. Methods produce and reproduce, to differing levels of success, the social. The census is a good example, as it is dependent on a particular understanding of geographic reality in order to function, and the census then replicates this process in turn. Evelyn Ruppert (2007) highlights the rapid increase in the numbers of people identifying themselves as ethnic Canadians, which she argued was led by the inclusion of that category in the census for the first time in 1986, having been self-included by a number of respondents in previous censuses. A new ethnic category was performed into being by the mechanism of

the census. This double step of methods being both constituted by and performative of the social, has strong parallels in the work of Foucault, and his recurring theme of particular concepts becoming 'taken for granted'. It further links Foucault's approaches to the work of STS scholars, here in relation to methods of bringing the self-evident into being.

Next, if methods are performative, and multiple method assemblages are at work, all with different ways of researching, then it is also the case that multiple, different realities are being performed. This is not simply an argument that different methods generate different views and perspectives of an already defined reality that exists entirely separately of attempts to 'see' it; but much more fundamentally suggests methods are actively creating different, overlapping and sometimes non-coherent realities. The example provided by Law and Singleton's study of ALD (alcoholic liver disease) is helpful here. This example comes from the medical world to which much cultural evidence-based policy work aspires and follows Law and Singleton's efforts to map the journey of an ALD patient. Instead of a single, coherent disease, what they found was a series of different realities, in different sites, with different, sometimes competing hinterlands and networks holding them in place. This is different to the enactment of reality as described by Latour and others, in that the uncertainty continues beyond the point of assemblage, after the formation of a hinterland and networks to hold a particular version of reality in place.

The point Law and Singleton are making is that ALD does not come in a singular form, but rather that it is "fractional, that it is more than one and less than many" (Law, 2004a, p. 74), and one of the processes taking place is active (and

never completed) work to enact a form of singularity out of this fractional state. The success or otherwise of this process goes back to the point of 'making knowledge that works, and realities which are fit for that knowledge'. Law and Singleton found that the object of their study did not remain a single object, slipping from ALD to liver disease, alcoholic cirrhosis, alcohol abuse, alcoholism, or overall quality of life (2004a, p.78). So, not only did 'it' have multiple versions under one name, 'it' also changed its name, whilst retaining the capacity to be seen as 'more or less' the same thing (fractionality).

Law argues that this level of fluidity is not a problem of itself, but problems arise in the "relations between different objects and their different contexts". (2004a, p.81). Law is careful to point out that this is not to say that methods can create whatever reality they like: they are still answerable to the environment in which they operate: if they don't fulfill a need, have advocates and patronage, and a suitable hinterland, their realities will not take hold and survive. Methods are fully implicated in the political, social, cultural world they inhabit, existing as part of the assemblages that co-constitute realities, rather than sitting outside looking in. Taking this route positions an understanding of method in opposition to the Shapin and Schaffer's modest witness, described by Haraway as "the specifically modern, European, masculine, scientific form of the virtue of modesty...that pays off its practitioners in the coin of epistemological and social power" (Haraway, p.25). Annemarie Mol (1999) argues that this implicates the academy in a responsibility beyond that of simple description, because 'simple description' does not exist. Every description is fully implicated in the process of constituting reality.

Law takes this a step further and talks about methods performing both manifest realities, and implicit, or collateral realities: manifest realities are the obvious ones, such as Ruppert's ethnic Canadians. Collateral realities are the ones that sneak past, embedded in method assemblages, for example the notion of the rational individual in social attitude surveys: these are realities not made manifest by the method, but which are both necessary to and reproduced and stabilized by the activity of the method.

In their 2011 paper, *The Double Social Life of Methods*, John Law, Evelyn Ruppert, and Mike Savage developed the idea of a 'triple lock', setting out a possible way to understand the method assemblage that holds performed realities in place. Their triple lock brings together three settings they argue are usually seen as separate. The first part of the triangle is the representations and findings, the researchers that 'do' the knowing and the descriptions, and the 'representations' being produced by the research. The second part is the 'realities' being described: the realities (and collateral realities) made manifest, being performed. The final part is the 'institutional' context, the advocates and circuits through which the findings flow. They argue that in order to understand the social life of methods it is necessary to consider all three together, rather than separately: the three elements work collectively to produce and reproduce "a complex ecology of representation, realities and advocacies, arrangements and circuits" (2011 p.13).

They take this further by stating that the combination of the three create a powerful 'triple lock', one that makes it very difficult to imagine things differently. Their argument means it is not possible to develop an effective understanding of

the way in which realities are being held in place without recognising and working with this triple lock: working with any one part on its own is necessarily flawed. The triple lock provides a operational model with which to explore the way in which a Foucauldian regime of truth might function as a cultural assemblage. The use of the triple lock model provides a depth and detail and adds in an ontological dimension to the exploration of 'the arts' as a particular version of Bennett's cultural assemblage.

3.6 Conclusion

This Chapter has developed the theoretical themes of this thesis, exploring a variety of ways to conceptualise culture, and by extrapolation how to take the sub set of culture that forms the subsidised arts out of its artistic and aesthetic box. This started with Bourdieu and culture as a social agent, an actor actively creating cultural capital, a useful beginning but one which left the cultural side of the equation strangely passive, despite the potential of culture as a field, imposing both norms of production and consumption. Culture as discourse, and particularly Foucauldian discourse, opened up further ground, and the exploration of culture as concrete and specific, historically contingent practice(s), with aesthetics as a Foucauldian technology of the self, given as a practical example. Finally, culture as an assemblage provided a mechanism for considering how concrete and specific cultural practices could be imagined and understood.

It has also set out the methodological principles of the thesis, again working with a combination of Foucauldian and ANT/STS tools. These start with a set of ways of looking, courtesy of Foucault, using an archaeological approach to

describe the set of materials under study, and then drawing on Foucault's genealogy to carry out the analysis. Following both Foucault and the ANT tradition, I will treat my material as a single working surface, and look for in-folding, in particular for processes of inscription, and for associated collateral realities, there but not there. I turned to Bennett for initial direction on the specifics of my empirical work, drawing on Foucault to focus on the concrete, specific and contingent processes which make up the particular cultural form of state funded arts. Finally, I brought in the work of Law et al on the social life of methods and the triple lock to open up a route for understanding why measurement has been so problematic for the subsidised arts and cultural sector in the UK.

The deliberate move away from more traditional Cultural Studies routes was taken to find a space where the theoretical landscape was not so intimately implicated and embedded within the research question itself. The history of the concept of culture and the development of cultural studies are part of the problem, and only by moving outside that landscape, and its own triple lock, has it been possible for me to consider alternative ways to understand and describe the problem at hand. My next Chapter builds out from this position, tracing the relationship between cultural studies and cultural policy, and drawing on the field of cultural economy to address current issues in cultural policy studies.

4. Bridging the Gap - Cultural Policy and Cultural Policy Studies

4.1 Introduction

This next Chapter moves on from the theoretical underpinning of this thesis to look in more detail at the relationship between cultural studies and cultural policy studies, situating my examination of cultural policy studies literature relevant to my thesis. I start by considering the definition of cultural policy, both situating the particular area of policy relevant to this thesis and recognising the performative nature of the definition itself. I reflect on the tensions and debates with cultural policy studies, beginning with the relationship between critical and applied studies, and revisit my decision to work within a Foucauldian and STS/ANT theoretical and methodological tradition. I then address the important difference between cultural economics and the field of cultural economy, which opens up the space to consider the development of policy in relation to impact and measurement of the subsidised arts in England.

4.2 Defining Cultural Policy

Cultural policy covers a very wide spectrum, far beyond the territory of this thesis. A pragmatic definition is that cultural policy encompasses the full range of contact between culture and the state. It covers the subsidised arts sector, the wider subsidised cultural sector, and what are described as the creative industries,

including the commercial arts sector, and extending also to gaming, architecture, and gambling if the DCMS areas of responsibility are taken as a guide. It can be supportive, through a range of mechanisms covering state funding, investment, tax breaks, industrial strategies and planning policy. It is also regulatory, largely through a range of licensing mechanisms through which performing arts other than comedy and spoken word are categorised as regulated entertainment and any premises in which regulated activity takes place has to be licensed.

From a cultural policy studies perspective McGuigan (2004) sets out a definitional framework for cultural policy as the relationship between the state and culture, demonstrating the way in which cultural policy pulls at will on differing versions of culture, from culture as the arts, through to culture as a way of life; on different ways of understanding the role of culture, as symbolic, as economic; and encompassing notions of state intervention ranging from financial support through to censorship. McGuigan's definition focuses on the cultural part of cultural policy, whereas Bell and Oakley's 2015 definition draws greater attention to policy. They flag up the links with public policy and argue that the development of cultural policy studies from a starting point within cultural studies means that the importance of the public policy dimension can be lost in the complexity of agreeing on the cultural element of cultural policy. They provide a definition of public policy as: "public policy is what governments choose to do or not to do" (2015, p.46), and place cultural policy within the context of public policy more generally.

Within this very broad field my focus is on those arts activities which receive grant aid via central government. This is quite a narrow focus, excluding both

significant activity types, and activities on the basis of their funding (commercially funded creative practice). Following the discussion in the previous Chapter, I view these categorisations as examples of performed realities, accepted rather than questioned, and in the very process of separating out and defining what is and is not the subject of this thesis, a performative action is taking place. This is an important point that is picked up again through the empirical work of this thesis, when considering how specific creative practices did or did not become subject to state funding.

4.3 Debates within Cultural Policy Studies

Before I move into a commentary on cultural policy studies literature as it applies to my focus on the challenge of measurement, there are some important tensions and debates within the wider field covered by a range of authors, including Bennett, O (2004), Gray (2010), Bell and Oakley (2015). These relate the very different theoretical and methodological approaches which have developed in different branches of cultural policy studies and which are important both to provide context and to make explicit where my own questions in relation to the role of the academy and the impact of these different theoretical traditions on the issue of measurement are situated within these debates.

The outline provided by Gray gives a helpful way into these debates. He identifies three main methodological camps: positivist, into which he places cultural economics; interpretivist, which includes approaches derived from cultural studies and which he further sub-divides, highlighting Gramscian and Foucauldian strands as the two dominant approaches; and realist, where he places sociology and political science. He argues that cultural policy studies risk

moving into separate silos, with work in one area not accessible to work in others, with practitioners viewing other approaches as incorrect. He suggests that the alternative, recognising and accepting a multiplicity of approaches would enable a more productive environment (2010, p.217).

Oliver Bennett's review article "*The Torn Halves of Cultural Policy Research*" (2004) makes a similar point to Gray. He highlights the distinction between what he describes as critical cultural policy studies, and practical or administrative cultural policy studies. Bennett places both the Gramscian and the Foucauldian approaches to cultural studies described above into the category of critical cultural policy studies, which he characterises as 'progressive', on one side of his divide, and practical or applied cultural policy studies on the other, and I explore these two categories in more detail below.

4.3.1 Critical Cultural Policy Studies

The introduction to Lewis and Miller's *Critical Cultural Policy Studies: A Reader* (2003), one of the texts reviewed by Bennett (2004), provides an overview of what the authors consider critical cultural policy positions. They set out their view that mainstream cultural policy, which they see as largely untheorized, tends to fall into one of two rhetorical positions: a market position, offering "the market as a system for identifying and allocating public preferences for culture" (p.4); and a second which "identifies certain artifacts as inalienably, transcendently, laden with value, but vulnerable to the public's inability to remain transcendental in its taste." (p.4).

A common characteristic in the critical approaches outlined by Lewis and Miller is the expectation of an explicit theoretical position. The challenge to critical

cultural policy studies, made by Oliver Bennett, is their capacity to engage with the operation of cultural policy on the ground. Lewis and Miller raise the issue of why cultural studies perspectives are under-represented in cultural policy and point at the unwillingness of cultural studies to engage in debates and development of cultural policy. They quote Cunningham's view that the "command metaphors of resistance and opposition (*within cultural studies*) predispose us to view the policy making process as inevitably compromised, incomplete and inadequate, people... ungrounded in theory and history or those wielding gross forms of political power for short term ends." (Cunningham 1992, p.9, Miller and Lewis, 2003, p.6), to argue that the theoretical positions taken up by critical cultural policy studies made it difficult to work with the messy and compromised environment that characterises cultural policy in action.

Bell and Oakley (2015) use different terminology to describe a similar scenario, placing cultural policy into four main categories: cultural policy as discourse, as text, as process and as practice. Cultural policy as text and as discourse roughly map onto Gray's critical, interpretivist grouping; however, their process and practice categories do not simply align with Gray's positivist or realist descriptions, and their descriptions of research which they categorise as process and practice have a clear resonance with both Foucauldian archaeology and ANT/STS.

4.3.2 Gramsci or Foucault?

The debate between Gramscian and Foucauldian approaches to critical cultural policy studies is important to understanding the role that the cultural studies tradition plays in the study of cultural policy, and the choice that I have made to

work within the Foucauldian tradition. Gray describes the difference as “an emphasis on ideology and hegemony on the one hand and the notion of governmentality on the other” (p.222). Both approaches have their merits, and following Gray’s request for researchers to be clear in their theoretical and methodological choices, I argue that it is more in their application that one has become better placed to work through the processes of studying cultural policy as it pertains to state funding of the arts.

The Gramscian tradition, with a focus on hegemony and ideology, has had as its primary area of study the world of popular culture, and its role in resistance to dominant ideologies. McGuigan (1996) makes a strong case for the role of a Gramscian inflected approach to cultural policy studies, adding in the work of Habermas and the concept of the public sphere, to criticise the use of Foucault as “a theoretical source for a kind of management consultancy in the service of cultural administration” (p.176), reflecting Habermas’ objection to Foucault on the basis of a deliberate lack of normative purpose. McGuigan criticises Tony Bennett’s use of Foucault, arguing that Bennett fails to consider how to find an effective balance between critical and useful knowledge. He argues that the Foucauldian framework for cultural policy studies offers nothing more than administrative usefulness because of its lack of normative principles and describes the overall approach as possibly a desire to “relinquish disengaged criticism and turn cultural studies as a whole over to governmental usefulness” (p.19). McGuigan also takes issue with Bennett’s conception of truth, describing it as “excessively pragmatic” (p.18), and therefore not able to take a role in a critical approach, as it is too dependent on its acceptability by the “present agents

of power” (ibid). McGuigan describes cultural policy as being about the conditions of culture, and fundamental to his position is a normative view that “in a democratic society, ‘the public will’...should decisively influence the conditions of culture, their persistence and their potential for change” (p.22).

To understand Bennett’s use of Foucault’s governmentality as implying a focus on state apparatus loses the point of governmentality as a much broader technology, one which can be productively used in multiple locations. This discussion of whether cultural policy studies should have a normative dimension is important and comes to the heart of why I took a Foucauldian route to addressing my research question. My aspiration is limited to wanting to arrive at a better understanding of the position that the cultural sector finds itself in, rather than starting with an expectation of where it should be. With that goal in mind, a methodology that takes a critical historical route should have the potential to be more productive than one that has a more normative dimension, as with that normativity can come a tendency to pre-suppose the outcome. The Foucauldian route, when allied with the ANT/STS position as outlined in the previous Chapter, does not take a normative perspective, but at the same time as asking the researcher to follow carefully the detailed empirical evidence, acknowledges that the political is present even at the ontological level.

A Foucauldian approach then does not operate as McGuigan suggests, purely in the service of government, and does allow the space to critique both inside and outside the workings of the state. On a more pragmatic level, the focus on popular culture and the role of resistance within Gramscian cultural studies can lead to a position in which the arguments about state intervention in the arts in

England focus simply on the rights and wrongs of funding high art as opposed to popular culture, rather than engaging with the detail of the way in which the impact of decisions in relation to state funding of the arts can be understood. Recent moves away from this territory have increasingly drawn on an STS approach, as evidenced by the work taking place within cultural economy as discussed below.

4.3.3 Applied Cultural Policy Studies

On the other side of this divide sits applied or practical cultural policy studies, and for this side Oliver Bennett reviews *Informing Cultural Policy* (Schuster, 2003). Schuster focuses on what has been the dominant theme for applied cultural policy studies, the issue of measurement, and the institutional structures and mechanisms that had been developed to support that process. Bennett's critique acknowledges that within the overall field of cultural policy research there should be work that concerns itself with the operational issues facing policy makers and at the time rhetoric around measurement in public policy was at a peak. However, he describes Schuster's work as investigating instrumental questions through techniques that had been cherry picked from empirical social science, with no reference to a theoretical hinterland. Although this is undoubtedly the case, it misses the strengths of Schuster's text, which focuses not on the why of cultural data, but the how (the very reason for Bennett's critique), the role of information infrastructure in the formation of policy, the design and management of such an infrastructure, and the complexities of the political field within which cultural policy is developed. Although these are not described as such by Schuster, they echo much of the discussion around the

social life of methods, and pre-figure issues raised by for example Campbell et al (2017), working in the field of cultural economy.

4.4 Cultural Economics and Cultural Economy

The final area I want to cover before moving onto a consideration of cultural policy studies literature relevant to the empirical work of this thesis are the two fields of cultural economics and cultural economy. Both consider the relationship between culture and economy, but from very different theoretical positions. Both are important to this thesis, for different reasons, and at this point of introduction it is important to define the two and establish the distinctions between them. Cultural economics as a recognized sub-discipline of economics is commonly identified as starting with Bowen and Baumol's 1966 work on Cost Disease, and at a very simple level, consists of the application of economic theory to the arts and culture. It is situated quite straightforwardly within Gray's positivist strand of cultural policy studies. Cultural economy on the other hand, focuses the process of thinking about the economy with and through culture and sits much more comfortably alongside critical cultural studies. I consider the two traditions separately, addressing their relevance and impact in relation to cultural policy as it pertains to state funding of the arts.

Throsby (2006) outlines the recurrent themes of cultural economics as the definition of public goods, industrial organization, firm behaviour (including cost-disease) and public subsidy of the arts, with common analytical methods neo-classical price theory, welfare economics, and public choice theory. Goodwin (2006) argues that as the discipline of economics developed, culture (in the

sense of arts and culture) was marginalized, seen as an expensive luxury that did not have anything to add to critical debates around the allocation of scarce resources. He highlights the influence of Adam Smith and his inclusion of the arts in his definition of unproductive labour, as set out in Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (Goodwin, 2006, p.331). Goodwin also highlights Jeremy Bentham, who viewed the fine arts as a sort of distraction and detraction from the usefulness and truth of science, with the only very limited value of being a more innocent distraction than the more unambiguously immoral habits of drinking, gambling etc. (Bentham, 1962 II p. 254). Here we can see the early crystallization of the core themes of cultural economics around defining value, the external positivities of the arts, and the need to justify public expenditure on the arts. This early problematization of the arts and the public realm resonates with the impact of ahistoricism within cultural policy debates described above. Arnold's views as expressed in *Culture and Anarchy* for example, could be understood, at least in part, in relation to this definition of the arts as unproductive and a distraction from usefulness. Reading Arnold's case for culture as a public good rather than as simply setting out the difference between high and popular culture would have given a very different slant on the use and impact of his work in the development of UK cultural policy.

Frey (Hutter and Throsby, 2008) argues that there is a division between arts (cultural) economists and arts administrators. The former, rooted in welfare economics, see their role as working out whether state intervention is necessary: unless an arts intervention produces external benefits not otherwise produced by the market, there would be no case for government support. Arts

administrators on the other hand, take the necessity for state intervention for granted, and see their role as advocating for that intervention. The way the two groups use economics is, according to Frey, dictated by these two different positions: arts economists favour willingness-to-pay studies as the best way to measure external benefits; whereas arts administrators focus on economic impact studies as they see these as most likely to stimulate government interest and involvement. Arts economists regard economic impact studies instigated to support advocacy for state intervention with suspicion (often because of what are seen by economists as unjustifiable claims for the economic impact of the arts, with multipliers exaggerated, and opportunity costs of alternative ways of achieving impact not taken into consideration), but equally their work does not take into account the need recognized by arts administrators for a 'call to action' to support the political decision making process. Here Frey is explicitly describing the different institutional networks within which the different representations circulate, with an underlying commitment to an already fixed and measurable external reality.

Significant work has taken place to reposition willingness to pay studies, and the theoretical position that underpins them, from cultural economics into the cultural policy field, driven by increasing pressure on financial resources (Bakhshi et al, 2009). The work to bring about this change is explicit in stating that the cultural policy world has previously rejected cultural economic theory because it challenged the position of the arts as ineffable: the representations and realities of cultural economic theory did not have a comfortable fit with the institutional world of the subsidised arts.

Bakhshi et al (2009) make an explicit argument that the techniques of cultural economics, specifically those relating to contingent valuation, provide a robust and authoritative method for measuring the intrinsic value of the arts. They argue that cultural economics achieves this valuation in a rigorous and non-reductive way, taking account of the 'multi-faceted' nature of the value of the arts, and providing a solution to the difficulties of producing a commensurable account of the value of the arts that is not realised through market routes. They suggest that the dominant position of arts policy makers: that the value of art is beyond measure, is not sustainable, highlighting that both the market, and the arts environment itself, quantify and measure value, either through straightforward pricing, or through prizes, performance opportunities, rankings and so on. They point to the hypocrisy of accepting market value of art in those areas amenable to market valuation, whilst denying the possibility of measuring value in other ways. They suggest that a practical route forward would be to establish a co-ordinated effort to raise awareness of contingent valuation and promote the teaching of cultural economics within UK universities.

O'Brien (2010) takes up that challenge of embedding measurement within cultural policy. His report, undertaken on behalf of the then Department of Culture, Media, and Sport, is explicitly rooted in understanding how the measurement of cultural value helps or hinders the development of cultural policy. In the context of the study, O'Brien adopted the arts administrator's position as described by Frey, looking for ways to demonstrate value that will activate political decision making. He argued that, in order to be effective in a policy context, culture needed to be valued using methods that are acceptable

to central government, and that these were set out most clearly in the Treasury's *Green Book*, which he saw as underpinned by a standard welfare economic position, aiming to achieve maximum welfare through the efficient allocation of public resources. As the market does not always provide for that efficient allocation, there is a need for intervention, and HM Treasury, via its *Green Book*, suggests that policy decisions should undergo Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to test benefits against costs. Therefore, as many of the costs and benefits as possible need to be expressed in monetary terms "including items for which the market does not provide a satisfactory measure of economic value" (HM Treasury 2003, p.4).

O'Brien argued that contingent valuation techniques best met this brief, at the same time however, acknowledging that the cultural sector itself was very unlikely to embrace a definition of culture that excludes more narrative accounts:

"It is only by fully articulating all forms of the benefits of culture, using the language of public policy and cultural value, that funding decisions can be made that are acceptable to both central government and the cultural sector." (O'Brien, 2010).

So, at the same time as arguing for economic techniques on the basis of their political efficacy, O'Brien also acknowledged the position, widely held within the cultural sector, that cultural value is not fully captured by those methods. O'Brien's recommendations included closer links between the cultural policy sector and the academic work of cultural economics, including the commissioning and dissemination of contingent valuation studies.

Both papers reflect attempts to bring the methods and techniques of cultural

economics into the sphere of cultural policy, making the case both on the basis of their rigour, and in relation to their political efficacy. Although the focus of cultural economics quite clearly encompasses questions of cultural value and was widely taken up in the cultural policy field, particularly in the form of economic impact studies, it has not been able to build a clear consensus around cultural value, with many studies regarded as less than robust, and O'Brien's later work (2014), picks up this point.

The field of cultural economy provides an entirely different framing of the relation between culture and economy, with the turn to culture reversing the idea that markets exist independently of their description (see for example, Miller and Rose 1990, Callon, 1998, DuGay and Pryke 2002). This draws very much on the same intellectual tradition set out in the previous Chapter, including both ANT/STS and the work of theorists such as Foucault and Bourdieu. Particularly relevant for this thesis, DuGay and Pryke (2002, p.2) highlight how processes such as accounting and marketing are implicated in shaping markets rather than just describing them, moving away from the idea that markets exist independently and prior to those descriptions.

More recently, arguments have been made that the work taking place within cultural economy had tended to focus on the economic side of the picture, for example Entwistle and Slater (2013), Cooper and McFall (2017) who state that "In literature within and influenced by Science and Technology Studies, actor-network theory and non-representational theory, questions of culture have figured rarely and faintly" (Cooper and McFall 2017, p.3). Entwistle and Slater (2013) elaborate on this point, stating that "Actor-network theory (ANT) does not

do 'cultural economy' symmetrically: it has had a lot to say about economy but much less to say about culture" (p.161). They make the case for the respecting of "the empirical realities of culture as it is performed and assembled", arguing for "analytical symmetry between the ways in which the 'problems' of culture and economy are posed" (p.166). They suggest that the use of ANT in cultural studies has been minimal and make the case for its use through their empirical example of the model's 'look', drawing on Knorr Cetina and Bruegger's work on financial markets to portray the fashion model's portfolio as a "moving assemblage" (p.173). Having developed their position they go on to argue that the same approach could be applied to more abstract cultural entities, such as "film or music genres...and art schools and traditions" (p.170). Happily, there is a growing strand of work within cultural economy that is to applying ANT/STS approaches to cultural policy, see for example O'Brien (2014), Campbell et al (2017), and which is taking a clearly articulated theoretical position into the territory of cultural policy on the ground. O'Brien (2014, loc.1744) makes the argument that cultural policy cannot be seen purely in relation to the aesthetic but must also be seen as "properly concerned with the economy too".

As with the challenge of standard cultural studies, cultural economics has become too closely implicated with the problem identified in this thesis to be a helpful analytical tool, rather than a part of the research problem itself. Again, the introduction of ANT/STS approaches, this time through cultural economy provide a more fruitful space in which to work. The increasing symmetry between culture and economy developing within the cultural economy tradition is helpful in reinforcing the potential of culture as assemblage as set out in Chapter Three,

with the added focus and reminder to consider the economic as part of that assemblage.

4.5 Cultural Policy Studies and Measuring Impact

The final section in this Chapter moves into the detail of cultural policy studies work in relation to measurement and state funding of the arts in England and sets the immediate context for the empirical work to follow. The starting point for this section is the apparent lack of policy underpinning state intervention in the arts for most of the twentieth century. This is identified by Selwood (2006), who suggests that prior to 1997, the ‘arms-length principle’ left strategy to the cultural agencies, and that those agencies “functioned in what was, effectively, a policy vacuum” (2006, p.35), with government providing at most a light touch oversight of governance, without any form of external performance management. Absence of policy documents does not necessarily mean absence of policy, with an alternative reading being that policy was implicit rather than explicit, however the point regarding the absence of visible central government policy is well made. Prior to the development of a sustained academic interest in cultural policy in relation to state funding of the arts in the UK, there were a small number of publications which discussed the Arts Council as the main state mechanism for funding the arts. These tended to take up more or less pre-determined positions, either supportive (White (1975), Sinclair (1995)) or critical (Pick (1991), and to a lesser extent Hutchison (1982)), and were largely un-theorised, with an underpinning adherence broadly to the Arnoldian view of culture.

Selwood (2006) points to the establishment of the DCMS (Department of Culture, Media and Sport) in July 1997 as the event which led to the first explicit

statement of state policy in relation to culture. The initial position of the DCMS was clear, as Selwood puts it; “Predicated on the assumption that cultural provision is instrumental and can deliver on government objectives, the Department’s sponsored (or subsidized) bodies have been required to commit to agreed targets” (ibid p.36). She states that; “no previous manifestation of Britain’s cultural policy has been based on the supposition of so highly determined a relationship between funding, cultural policy, its implementation and outcomes.” However, she argues that this position proved difficult to sustain, with the statements of successive Ministers “cast doubt on the notions of there being a secure relationship between the Department’s aims and outcomes” (ibid, p.39).

Schuster’s (2002) publication, *Informing Cultural Policy*, discussed earlier in relation to the tension between critical and applied cultural policy studies, gives a helpful account of the state of cultural policy research at the beginning of the twenty-first century. This does not ignore the challenges made to the publication by Oliver Bennett, however, with that critique in mind, it is still a useful historical document in its own right. Schuster highlights the very basic repertoire of contemporary data collection, focusing on descriptions of supply, how many, what and where; and the gradual move into counting demand, driven by increasing state interest in who was taking part in cultural activity (p.200). He identifies factors which inhibit analysis, arguing for example, that a focus on numbers rather than analysis is driven by political imperatives not to produce critical narratives (p.18); that staff tasked with carrying out cultural policy research in the field are not trained social scientists (p.22); and the challenge

provided by research combined with evaluation and with advocacy, arguing that the combination compromises the capacity of cultural policy institutes to carry out robust research.

Particularly relevant to this thesis is his exploration of the impact of the budget and operational structure of the Arts Council of Great Britain and its successor, the Arts Council of England, on cultural policy research, starting with the development of a Research and Development Directorate in 2000 as part of the slimmed down and more strategically focused Arts Council working with the Regional Arts Boards, which was then drawn into the 2001 proposal to restructure and merge the regional boards back into the central operation. At the point Schuster was writing, the implications of the restructure for cultural policy research were not clear, and he argues for two possible outcomes:

“on the one hand, with an even stronger role for a national strategic office for arts funding, one might expect research to play a stronger role; on the other, to the extent that this reorganisation represents a re-strengthening of the hegemony of the disciplinary art-form officers, one might expect a move away from research as an unnecessary expense” (Schuster, 2002, p.126).

This perspective, written at the time of the restructure, provides an invaluable insight into the different forces at play in relation to the status of research within the Arts Council. Schuster also discusses the research function of the relatively new Department of Culture Media and Sport, suggesting that the level of research undertaken by the department appeared surprisingly low, and quoting Paul Allin (former Chief Statistician, Statistics and Social Policy Unit, DCMS)

“There has undoubtedly been a view that we can do arts policy without the data. I think that view has long since passed, but it means we are starting from a low base” (p.133). Again, this offers a way into a particular moment in the development of cultural policy research in the UK.

Although not framed as such, Schuster’s descriptions of research within both the Arts Council and the DCMS enable them to be viewed as forms of method assemblages. What can be seen is the way that historically contingent factors, such as the re-organisation of the Arts Council, affect the way in which the assemblage functions, and how it holds together. Schuster refers to a hegemony, which I would reframe as a regime of truth, and as discussed at the end of the last Chapter, therefore potentially as a form of triple lock (Law, Ruppert and Savage, 2011 p.13) with the position of ‘researcher’ taken by the experts and policy makers ‘doing arts policy without the data’; ‘the realities out there’ the arts activities in receipt of state funding, and ‘the institutions and networks’ the organisations, government departments and informal connections operating across the subsidised arts sector.

As identified by Schuster, academic cultural policy studies’ interest in impact and measurement first crystallised in the UK with the emergence of *Cultural Trends*, a key journal in the field, which had started publication as compendium of cultural statistics, published by the Policy Studies Institute and funded by a range of cultural institutions, including the UK Arts Councils; and which was re-launched as a peer reviewed journal in 1998. It is described by Schuster (2002) as unique in the field, because of its combination of statistical evidence, commentary and interpretation, juxtaposing it with what he then saw as the two

standard and opposing categories of the 'neutral' government statistic, published without interpretation, and practice-based publications, which tended to sacrifice rigour in favour of advocacy. Selwood (2017) describes the measurement of performance and impact as "fundamental to Cultural Trends" (p.312).

However, well into the 2000s there is little evidence of cross over between cultural policy studies and cultural policy formation. Selwood (2006) argues that academics researching cultural policy had little influence and were not 'leading the way' in developing theoretical models to overcome the inconsistencies at the heart of central government cultural policy. This argument has been amplified by others, working across a range of cultural policy studies perspectives. Pinnock (2008) argued that there was an unwillingness on the part of policy makers and arts advocates to engage with the effectiveness or otherwise of cultural policy tools, or even to set out explicitly what was being attempted. Pinnock wanted to see cultural policy engage more fully with hypothetico-deductive research, albeit qualifying this with an awareness of "far-from-resolved philosophical disputes about the strengths and limitations of conventional scientific method" (p.141). He argued that the reason for the lack of theoretical underpinning was because funding for the arts and culture was being allocated before the development of relevant social-scientific theory. He contrasts this with the position for medicine and the physical sciences where theoreticians had set out a "hypothetico-deductive agenda for policy discussion" (p.141) before state intervention. Although Pinnock is operating within a different theoretical tradition his point about the lack of theoretical foundations is helpful, and the particular point to pick up is Pinnock's view of the effect of this lack of theorization.

“With no real idea how means (public subsidy) related to ends (high quality arts accessible to the public), policymakers had simply to assume that more of one meant faster progress toward the other” (p.141).

The argument simply for more funds is one that becomes very visible in the following empirical Chapters, demonstrating the validity and strength of this point. Pinnock develops the argument that this lack of theorization leads to an emphasis on ends rather than means, with ‘self-evidently desirable’ outcomes, apparently achieved by untested and untheorized processes. He argues that the continuing lack of theory makes the increasing administrative drive to collect ever more data from the field, an effort identified by Oliver Bennett as a key part of applied cultural studies, less than productive. Without a strong theoretical basis, the collected data continues to ‘fail’, that is, it does not demonstrate clear success or failure against specified outcomes.

Gibson (2008) provides a similar challenge, albeit from a very different theoretical position, and specifically in relation to the cultural policy debate surrounding the instrumental versus intrinsic role of culture. The instrumental versus intrinsic value debate has been one of the dominant themes within applied cultural policy, particularly in the 1990s and 2000s when the supposed instrumental value of the arts was a key driver for government policy.

In a very simplified way, instrumental outcomes are characterized as the effects that participation in cultural activities have on areas of concern to central and local government, such as health, regeneration, social inclusion and community cohesion; whereas intrinsic values are held to be those factors inherent within the cultural activity itself (a position which draws heavily on post-

Kantian aesthetics).

Gibson (2008) demonstrates that instrumentality is not a recent phenomenon. For example, she points to the development of the V&A Museum, which first started in 1852 as a Museum of Manufactures. It was specifically and explicitly established to achieve economic and social goals (improving the technical knowledge and skills of 'mechaniks', and providing a distraction from London gin palaces, both instrumental activities entirely at home within modern policy frameworks). Gibson argues that the failure of contemporary cultural institutions and cultural policy practitioners to draw on that history is more to do with the time frames within which they operate, which tend to be short to medium term, rather than the lack of knowledge implied by Pinnock, but in a similar vein to Pinnock suggests that this failure leads to an attitude of essentialism (i.e. a de-contextualized, ahistorical version of cultural institutions), arguing that this destabilizes the sector, making it vulnerable to change, and unable to manage criticism.

Gibson provides a clear description of the practical outcomes of the sector's unsubstantiated claims for the role of culture in driving instrumental change. Without a longer historical context and a stronger theoretical research base, a significant percentage of the claims for instrumental effects (many using approaches derived from cultural economics) made during the 1990s and 2000s were demonstrably flawed, with the result that key policy documents such as the McMaster Review (2008) were able to challenge the whole notion of instrumentality and return to intrinsic values as the only way to understand culture.

Belfiore and Bennett (2007) argue that current cultural policy debates are stuck with a false split between intrinsic and instrumental outcomes and challenge the whole notion of arts and culture as a shared and understood concept, and the associated commensurability of experiences of the arts. They argue that a historical perspective shows that instrumentalism has a long tradition and there have been both positive and negative views of the impact of the arts, as well as the aesthetic or autonomous view. Belfiore and Bennett argue that a language and a context for the current arts funding debate does exist within its long history, but is being ignored, allowing for the selective and reductive use of key ideas, which are then given the status of a general truth. They talk about the need for a more nuanced approach to the 'understanding of how the arts can affect people' (p.195), and that this can better take place situated within an understanding of the intellectual history of the debate. Both Gibson (2008) and Belfiore and Bennett (2007) are arguing that the essentialized and historically de-coupled intrinsic versus instrumental debates taking place within cultural policy are unhelpful and unproductive. They point to the huge risks of returning to a wholly untheorized environment and situate cultural policy work within its historical context, arguing that progress towards a more nuanced understanding will only come from an appreciation and use of that context. Although Belfiore and Bennett do not draw directly on Foucault, their discussion harks back to the invisibility of Foucauldian concepts within cultural policy literature. I now turn to recent work which is starting to use Foucault and ANT/STS to address the difficulties created by this ahistoricism within cultural policy.

O'Brien (2014, loc 718) draws on the work of Burchell et al (1991) and Miller

and Rose (1992, 2008), to argue that governmentality is a valuable concept for cultural policy, through its combination of institutional analysis and attention to the theoretical tools of government. This provides a practical way forward, one which is taken up by Campbell et al (2017) in their review of more recent cultural policy work, which comes to a very similar conclusion as to the difficulties of ahistoricism, this time in relation to studies of culture led regeneration. Their paper also demonstrates the potential of ANT/STS approaches to cultural policy, by using the social life of methods (Law, Ruppert and Savage 2011, Law and Ruppert 2013) to frame their discussion.

The authors consider why a persistent pattern of failure to demonstrate impact (using what they describe as 'social science like' methods) has developed, and they highlight six potential explanations, all of which are relevant to this thesis. The first is the use of short term data to see long term outcomes, stating that "if evidence gathering is repeatedly linked only to time-limited interventions, evidence of long-term impact will, by definition, not be found" (p.52). This means not only that long-term studies are rarely used within cultural policy but that there is little consideration of the long-term impact of cultural policies. The second is the low level of priority given to culture within the broader policy context of increasingly limited resources. Here they highlight the role of advocacy and the relative importance given to evidence used to carry out the work of advocacy. They argue that the relatively low priority given to culture in the wider public policy context has a 'social life' resulting in particular consequences, including the inability to corral the resources necessary to carry out effective long-term research. Although this is undoubtedly correct, I would also argue that the focus

on advocacy is more strongly linked to their third point, the lack of clarity about the goals of the research, and the assumption that “the starting point of research is to position cultural activity as a known benefit with known effects” (p.54). They also link this back to the role of advocacy in research, and also point out that despite an increased visibility of the potential of research to demonstrate impact, funding has proceeded in much the same way as it did before. They echo the view expressed by both Pinnock (above) and in Tony Bennett’s “ghostly, disembodied agents” (Bennett, 2007, p.32), with their view that

“without articulation of a mechanism by which culture has a role to play, evidence gathering can involve a ‘sweeping up’ of any available information that can add weight to the beneficial role of culture, veering away from research and towards advocacy” (p.54).

Their fourth point is that measurement is not always feasible, although their argument appears to be that this is more to do with failure to develop methods that could measure impact, because of the combined impact of lack of resources, the imperative to produce advocacy material, and the contested nature of arts and culture. As I started to set out in Chapter Three, I would also argue that the foundational route of post-Kantian aesthetics in the assemblage that makes up ‘the arts’ is a further and fundamental block to measurement. They go on to argue that the challenges of measurement underpin their fifth point, the over-emphasis on the economic, because of its relative simplicity, as well as the importance of the economic to the wider public policy tied up in regeneration. Finally, they highlight the tendency for information, accurate or not, to travel from one location to another, increasingly free from any provenance. They discuss the potential of

big data in the context of cultural regeneration, and argue that there is a need for caution, with complex statistical methods only as good as the data that goes into them. They situate their explanation as the social life of methods, and argue that, despite their known flaws, the methods and processes used to make the case for cultural regeneration are deeply embedded and persistent.

In summary, a lack of theoretical underpinning has left impact measurement within cultural policy either marginalised as not capturing the essence of culture, or lionised and using methods beyond their capacity to make over-reaching claims for the benefits of state expenditure on culture. The timely recognition of the need to focus more on the culture part of cultural economy has opened up the potential for a more theoretically informed approach, which can pick up both questions of cultural value and the very real effect of situating those questions within a public policy context.

Bringing together Bennett's description of a cultural assemblage and Law's description of "looking up and centring" opens up the way to consider the term 'the arts' as an aggregation (assemblage). This is a drawing together and simplification in order to create an entity amenable to policy development, in a world where the intricate differences between multiple artistic activities have no purchase. Getting policy developed and adopted draws on the pragmatic and the political, and aggregation generates not only simplicity but scale, in particular the numerical and economic scale which creates a visibility more likely to attract the level of interest that leads to policy making.

4.6 Conclusion

This Chapter has bridged the gap between the earlier theoretical work and

literature focused on the specific empirical question underpinning this thesis. It started by considering definitions of cultural policy and providing the frame to enable a focus on the specific elements of cultural policy as they relate to state funding of the arts. It then moved on to consider the debates and tensions within cultural policy studies, and the long-standing division between a critical academic study of cultural policy and applied cultural policy which has historically been characteristic of much if not most cultural policy studies. The former theoretically informed but only fleetingly engaged with operational cultural policy and historically unwilling to wrestle with the issue of measurement; the latter operating in a theoretical vacuum and taking a more or less pick and mix approach to the use of measurement tools adapted from empirical social science.

This supported a further discussion as to why this thesis takes a largely Foucauldian approach and highlighted the ongoing split between critical and applied cultural policy studies, which has left cultural policy makers without easy access to theoretically informed approaches. This theme was picked up in more detail as I explored the literature pertaining to measurement, demonstrating that lack of access to theoretically informed perspectives has left cultural policy makers more likely to succumb to the charms of evidence as advocacy, recognising and valuing the importance and power of advocacy in decision-making, rather than addressing the much thornier issues of academic rigour. The opportunity coming in from cultural economy, and from work such as O'Brien (2014) and Campbell et al (2017) is fairly new to the arts debate and although it is rapidly gaining purchase, is still at the edges rather than the centre of

discussions beyond the academy.

5. Refining the Problem

5.1 Introduction

As set out in my overall introduction, the goal of the thesis is to develop a better understanding of why the arts and cultural sector has had such trouble developing mechanisms that enable it to measure the impact of its activities. It was the emergence in close succession of two large scale sample surveys, and the subsequent challenge of establishing and using meaningful outcomes from those surveys, which triggered the development of this thesis, and therefore this Chapter opens up the empirical territory with an exploration of the two sample surveys, following in the footsteps of Law 's 2009 study of the Eurobarometer and using the principles of Foucauldian archaeology to work through a detailed descriptive analysis of the text of the surveys.

5.2. The Taking Part Survey

The Taking Part survey is a national statistic, commissioned by the Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). It is described on the DCMS website as follows:

“The Taking Part survey collects data on many aspects of leisure, culture and sport in England, as well as an in-depth range of socio-demographic information on respondents. The need for consistent, high

quality national data on engagement with culture and sport led to DCMS and 3 partners (Arts Council England, Historic England and Sport England) commissioning the Taking Part survey, the first of its kind to provide data of this quality.” (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/taking-part>, accessed 10 May 2015).

More detail is provided in the survey briefings, with the Taking Part survey briefing no.10 (September 2009) describing the survey as follows:

“Respondents are asked about their engagement in culture, leisure and sport in the 12 months prior to interview. The questions cover their attendance at a wide variety of arts events, museums, galleries, libraries and heritage sites, and about their participation in creative activities and sport. The survey also asks about motivations and barriers to cultural attendance and participation and collects a large quantity of socio-demographic information such as each respondent’s age, occupation, income, health and ethnicity.” (p. 2)

These two descriptions, although accurate in themselves, present a smoothing of the drivers and processes that have influenced the development of the survey. This process is not particularly unusual, or problematic, and reflects descriptions in the previous Chapter of the process of creating policy (see for example Stevens 2010, O’Brien 2014), with evidence used more as a signifier for authenticity rather than in the more detailed way it might be used in an academic context. This smoothing action is an important area for investigation and here I draw on Law’s notion of ‘looking up and centring’, to position the term

‘the arts’ as an inscription device, folding in and losing sight of the detail of what is, and what is not included within it.

The first Taking Part data collection took place in 2005 and the survey has been running continuously, if not longitudinally, ever since, providing a statistical base with over ten years of data. The statistics are robust at a national level: the survey is carried out through face-to-face interviews, in sufficient number to provide robust statistics at a national level, with regional analyses also possible. The data cannot be directly used at a local level. When the survey started in 2005-6 some 28,500 interviews were scheduled, however the total number of interviews each year has reduced, due to funding constraints, and now stands at 10,000. The questions have largely remained the same, with some revisions, including the addition of a longitudinal element in 2012/13 (year 8 of the survey).

The immediate development of the Taking Part survey appeared to stem from the desire of the Treasury department to measure the impact of central government spending, and specifically in the case of the DCMS, to understand the impact of central government spending on engagement in culture, by measuring levels of engagement in activities funded directly through the DCMS and its arms-length bodies (the detail behind this is covered in Chapter Nine below). It did not need or set out to capture data on activities which sat outside the funding remit of the DCMS. This driver is visible, if not explicit, in the detail of the survey, but is not visible in the descriptions given above, which talk simply about engagement in culture and sport. This seemingly basic simplification loses sight of the significant role played by both the funding itself and the mechanisms through which that funding is distributed. This process of simplification could

again be considered as an act of inscription, following the ANT approach, as an act of centring and abstraction, following Law, or as a process of naturalisation following Foucault. All three suggest that the loss of visibility of these significant institutional actors is likely to play a significant part in this narrative. In particular, the loss of visibility of the economic, through the subsumption of funding, harks back to the arguments coming out of the field of cultural economy as discussed in the previous Chapter (see for example Du Gay and Pryke, 2002, Campbell et al 2017).

The detailed description of the survey which follows is the bedrock of this thesis: as I have started to argue above, the loss of knowledge of the definitions and categories that form the basis of the statistically robust survey outputs is a core mechanism, facilitating the taken-for-grantedness of the particular world which produced them, and an archaeological approach, starting with an interrogation of the question set, opens up the survey again, and foregrounds the places to look for the accretive incidents which are embedded within it (the background to the analysis, together with extracts from the survey question set, is set out in appendix two). It takes the 2014-15 adult questionnaire as the base document for the description and highlights relevant changes that have taken place in the questionnaire prior to the 2014-15 survey. At the time of writing a new version of the survey is in development, however the planned changes are not covered here.

The print-out version of the 2014-15 survey question set covers 225 pages and is used by the interviewer as the basis for the face to face interview with the respondent. The first three sections (20 pages) are devoted to demographic data

and checking that the person answering the questions is the expected respondent. Here the survey is demonstrating its careful adherence to the standard categories, procedures and practices of the sample survey, thus recruiting to it the vast hinterland that goes along with the sample survey. The status as a National Statistic is highlighted on the Taking Part website: this status is a crucial part of the hinterland which gives the data coming out of the survey its stability (for a discussion on the role of sample surveys in the development of social science see for example, Savage 2010).

The fifth section asks about activities the respondent undertook when growing up, firstly asking about a limited range of activities (those relevant to this thesis are museums or art galleries; theatre, dance or classical music performances); and then asking about a second set of activities (including reading for pleasure, drawing or painting, writing stories, poems, plays or music, playing a music instrument, acting, dancing or singing, playing video/computer games).

These questions can be read as very simply providing a count of engagement: whether or not the respondent took part in a particular set of activities, and if yes, how often that happened, standard practice for a sample survey. However, inscribed within them are two areas that need to be re-opened: firstly, the list of activities, and then the separation of those activities into two sets, which starts the process of defining as separate and fundamental two ways of engaging with culture: attendance and participation. Looking in particular at the first set (attendance), the statement “Go to theatre or to see a dance or classical music performances”: excludes non-classical music performance, limiting not only the range of possible positive responses, but also the understanding of what is

expected as a response in relation to questions about arts attendance. Motivation is raised only in relation to reading, where reading has to be done for pleasure, excluding reading for specific external purposes. Motivation and external purposes are not reflected in any of the other possible activities and specifically here are no similar moves made in relation to drawing, painting, singing or music performance, all of which could also have been undertaken as a requirement for school, religious, community or cultural purposes. At the time of the development of the survey (and continuing to date) literacy and the process of reading for education was not the responsibility of the DCMS, which, through its relationship with Arts Council England had responsibility only for the development and funding of literature as an art form, whereas literacy was the responsibility of the Department of Education. Several lines of enquiry are starting to emerge: the definition and separation of attendance and participation; the limited range of activities which count as engaging in the arts; and the relation of the question set to its structural backdrop.

The questionnaire then moves on to ask about activities as an adult, starting with a list of free time activities. This list is more extensive than that used for the recollection of experiences when growing up, however there are similar actions taking place, for example the use (and therefore reinforcement of) theatre and music concerts as a proxy for experiencing live performance (although the word classical is not used, the use of the word concert implies a different experience from that of a gig or music festival); and the separation of listening to music or watching TV from attending a music concert.

These separations are starting to generate a sense of what counts as cultural

engagement and what does not, and this is built on in the next section, titled *Section A – Arts, Libraries, Archives, Museums and Heritage*, and which focuses on activity within the last twelve months. The title reflects the administrative and governance structures which underpinned the delivery of DCMS responsibilities at the time of the development of the survey, specifically the names of the non-departmental bodies responsible for these areas of activity (Arts Council England, the MLA (Museums, Libraries and Archives), and English Heritage), again building the sense of the importance of that organisational backdrop to the structuring of the survey.

The work to establish participation and attendance as the two basic categories in relation to arts engagement continues, with two separate question sets, the first addressing participation, the second attendance. Close reading of the arts participation questions highlights a number of areas for further consideration: the use of named art-forms as the basis for categories; that some art-form genres are named explicitly (ballet, opera/operetta, carnival), whilst others are described much more broadly (other dance, play/drama); that one category only is given an additional description (street arts); the explicit exclusion of family or holiday photographs or videos (with the use of the word ‘snaps’ implying that a judgement about artistic quality and motivation underpins the exclusion); and the inclusion of motivation in relation to reading, with an additional exclusion of newspapers, magazines or comics, reinforcing the connection between the reading category and literature. Follow up questions again establish whether the activities were done in the respondent’s own time, or for work, academic or volunteering purposes, and then the frequency of carrying out the activities.

The arts attendance questions throw up a similar set of considerations, again working with a de-limited list of activities which pick up the themes first identified in relation to the questions about engagement ‘when growing up’. All of the points made above are still present: the reinforcement of art-form categories; the marginalization or exclusion of activities that do not fit; the implicit expectations about where engagement take place; and the reflection of the structure of arts funding organisations in the structure of the questions. Some are more obviously visible than others, for example the four music categories: opera/opera, classical music performance, jazz performance and other live music event; and the four dance categories of ballet, contemporary dance, African people’s dance or South Asian and Chinese dance, other live dance event. As I detail in the later Chapters, their presence makes sense in the context of the detail of Arts Council funded activities, however if the survey is, as it states, designed to understand public engagement in the arts more widely, then having such narrowly defined categories becomes problematic.

This raises further questions about the relationship between the questionnaire structure, the structuring of the Arts Council, and the areas of activity it funds. As with the participation question, some of the categories are given additional definition (street arts, culturally specific festival, public art installation or display); and some activities (crafts markets and circus with animals) are explicitly excluded.

The use of the phrase culturally specific festival to denote festivals particularly associated with Black and Minority Ethnic communities is notable in its implication that other activities are not culturally specific, which hints at a lack of

theorization behind the development of the question set. As I will discuss below, there were good policy reasons for wanting to know the level of attendance at activities which might disproportionately attract people from BAME communities, however the use of the phrase culturally specific to describe these events could be seen as demonstrating a lack of awareness that the other activities being listed largely reflected a specific set of Western European cultural pursuits (and, in common with every cultural activity, are thus just as culturally specific as anything else on the list).

Less immediately obvious here, because of its complete absence, is the non-appearance of television, radio, or digital viewing. Within this absence, is an implicit assumption that countable viewing must take place in specific locations outside the home: engagement as an audience member requires movement to a specific kind of space, 'have you been to?', a space where cultural activity takes place, which starts to make sense of the additional description deemed necessary for street arts, a category which contains a much less bounded sense of place.

At the same time this omission also reflects the initial purpose of the survey, measuring the impact of funding distributed via the NDPBs, rather than its later role of understanding cultural engagement, and demonstrates the strong relationship between funding mechanisms and the structure of the survey. Although there is huge public investment in television and radio broadcasting through the BBC license fee, this was not part of the system under scrutiny and therefore, although it might be considered integral to the understanding an overall pattern of cultural engagement, it was not considered in any detail within

the survey framework.

The final missing information is any check as to whether the activity that the respondent either attended or took part in, was publicly funded. Admittedly, members of the public might not know the answer to that question, but it is possible to imagine ways in which a proxy might have been obtained, if only by asking who the provider of the activity was.

The final set of questions in this sub section expanded on a specific response to question 17: Other live music. Respondents who said that they had attended other live music either in their own time or as part of voluntary work, were asked a set of follow up questions expanding on possible music genres and localities, and which through that expansion of the range of possibility for cultural activity, provides a counterbalance to some of the structural issues outlined above. However, the categories listed are still very narrow, with for example, the collapsing of all possible music forms associated with specific parts of the world into singular geographically named categories (a very similar move to the culturally specific festival description given above).

Across the two question areas, adult attendance and participation, significant work has gone into defining the shape of arts engagement, as a twin-tracked entity combining participation in specific activities, and attendance, not only of specific activities, but also in particular kinds of spaces. What is missing is the relationship between those activities and the financial model through which they have been delivered. In the absence of this last feature it is difficult to see how the question set could deliver on the original aim of the survey. The question as to why there is no clear way to establish the financial basis of the activities

appears to suggest that visibility of the possibility that relevant activity could be taking place other than through public subsidy had been lost.

The next section relevant to this thesis is section 6.2.6 Museums and Galleries, which again asks questions about attendance. The questions on museums and galleries as a distinct and separate entity to other cultural spaces are carrying out a particular action: supporting the existence of a single category for museums and galleries, and thus centring and privileging a particular kind of cultural space, by asking not about what is done in the space, but about the space itself. This reinforces the idea of appropriate (and inappropriate) physical locations for culture implied earlier in the question on arts attendance. The question as to why this space and not others comes back to the drivers for creating the survey and understanding the impact of government funding.

The survey then moves into sports and physical exercise, which provides a useful comparative to the 'culture' section. There are some notable differences between the 'Walking, Cycling and Sports Participation' section (27 pages long) and the 'Arts, Libraries, Museums and Heritage' section (15 pages long). The sports section focuses solely on participation and does not explore any form of sports attendance. Again, this highlights the importance of organisational structures and their funding decisions to the design of the survey. Sports attendance was not a publicly funded activity and therefore did not fall within the scope of the survey. This difference in approach hints at the difference in the perceived value of attendance at arts and sports events, with one being characterized as a public good and therefore worthy of public funds, the other not and therefore not of interest. The taken-for-grantedness of the inclusion of

the former and the exclusion of the latter demonstrates the extent to which this dichotomy was and is a wholly accepted and unchallenged distinction. The other notable area of difference is the significantly more detailed question set, with 62 separately listed sports and physical activities, and questions around intensity as well as frequency. Some of this difference relates to the different funding structure for sports, with sports governing bodies funded individually via Sport England, the non-departmental public body responsible for sports participation. Again, the importance of the underlying funding and governance structures comes to the fore in the overall design of the questionnaire.

Having established the extent of engagement, the questionnaire moves on to consider the levers of engagement, starting with questions about levels of enjoyment and whether the respondent is likely to do the activity again, and/or recommend it to a friend or family member. The next set of questions asks for opinions about the arts. Neither set appears to fit neatly with the role of the survey in supporting the PSA targets. At the point of the initial analysis, the purpose of these questions and their role in the survey was unclear, however tracking back the antecedence of the surveys (see Chapters Eight and Nine below) it became clear that these particular sets of questions (along with others) came directly from previously commissioned question sets within the Omnibus Surveys, and that the objectives of those surveys were to provide marketing intelligence for Arts Council funded organisations and to provide information to support advocacy for arts funding (this is discussed in detail in the later Chapters). It is the first time that the relationship between culture and locality appears in the survey. However, the design of the survey is such that analysis much below national level cannot

be carried out. So, although this might be an interesting question to ask from a national policy perspective, the data cannot be understood in relation to the availability or otherwise of culture in particular localities, and is only useable for high level advocacy, rather than operational purposes such as informing planning decisions in relation to the siting of new facilities.

The capacity to see at a geographically more detailed level was not designed into the structure of the survey. The available budget would not allow for the number of in-person interviews necessary to obtain data that would allow for robust analysis at a top tier local authority level, and the level of detail about engagement that could be obtained from face to face interviews was deemed more important than the ability to see below the national level. The Active People Survey, developed by Sport England, and discussed in more detail below, opted for a telephone survey, which lost some of the opportunity for detail, but did mean that analysis was robust down to the local authority level. The role of geography is a crucial thread: the PSA targets are national, so it makes sense to measure at a national level. However, the actions that have an impact on what is being measured happen locally. Local Authorities, which do (or did) have local cultural policies by their very nature set those policies and work at the local level. The development of the survey in such a way as to provide national level analysis reflects its initial focus but has provided a significant challenge with the use of the data by those responsible for cultural activity, most of which takes place in specific geographic locations, and in the cultural spaces implied in the earlier questions on participation and attendance. The only distribution routes that are not geographically located (broadcasting and on-line access) are the very

distribution routes not covered within the Taking Part questions.

A longitudinal element was added to the study in 2012, in response to questions about the validity of the data from a longitudinal perspective. As a result, a proportion of the respondents in each subsequent survey is drawn from the respondents to the previous iteration. This allowed the inclusion of questions about change, with sections on the impact of life events and on changes to participation. This move draws on the hinterland of large scale sample surveys, and by adding in the longitudinal element, reinforces the capacity to derive robust findings from the data. It does nothing to address the issues identified above in relation to the definitions visibly and invisibly embedded within the survey, or the omission of geography.

5.3 The Active People Survey

For completeness it is important to consider the second large scale national sample survey: The Active People Survey. Commissioned by Sport England, this survey ran from 2005 to 2015 and has now been replaced by the Active Lives Survey. It aimed to collect 500 completed questionnaires annually from every Local Authority area in England, approximately 191,000 in total. Its primary focus was on collecting data to support the work of Sport England, however from April 2008 through to 2010 it also included a set of questions called the DCMS cultural questions, and these have now been reintroduced into the Active Lives Survey. It is the role of APS in collecting cultural data which is relevant here.

The survey was conducted using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing

(CATI), and therefore there is not a comparable downloadable linear version of the questionnaire as used in the analysis of the Taking Part Survey. However, briefing notes were produced, to “explain the rationale behind the methodology, and “how each question works”” (APS3 briefing note). The briefing states that the question set has been carried forward from APS1 and 2, and any changes are highlighted in the text, and therefore the APS3 note has been used as the source material for the following section. As with the Taking Part Survey, there is an emphasis on the robustness of the data collection, with the scale and nature of the survey described before its purpose. There is a clear statement about the purpose of the questionnaire, in this case specifying its role in the measurement of key performance indicators, a much more tightly defined role. It does not mention the introduction of the cultural questions (which were introduced part way through the APS2 data collection cycle). The introduction to the APS 3 questionnaire briefing note states:

“The survey questionnaire has been designed specifically to measure a number of Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s). As well as measuring overall levels of participation and levels of volunteering, it measures four other Key Performance Indicators - club membership, receipt of instruction or coaching, access to competitive sport opportunities, and satisfaction with local sports provision. In addition, the questionnaire has been designed to collect demographic information to enable analysis of the data by gender, social class, ethnicity, household structure, car ownership, educational attainment and disability”.

Looking specifically at the DCMS cultural questions, the briefing note states:

“THESE QUESTIONS WERE ADDED INTO THE SURVEY IN MID APRIL 2008 TO MEASURE THE NATIONAL INDICATOR SET FOR CULTURE, NI9, 10 and 11. THE BASELINE FOR THESE INDICATORS WAS COLLECTED BETWEEN MID APRIL – MID OCT 2008. BASELINE DATA FOR NI 9, 10, 11 WAS PUBLISHED BY DCMS IN DECEMBER 2008.”

The first set of questions asks about each of the indicator areas in turn, and in each case the response options are very simply yes, no or don't know:

- “During the last 12 months, have you attended a museum or gallery at least once?
- During the last 12 months, have you used a public library service at least once?
- Have you attended any creative, artistic, theatrical or musical events in the last 12 months?”

There is then a supplementary question for people who answered yes to attending a creative, theatrical or musical event, asking how many times, with response options of one, two, three or more, don't know (the interviewer was instructed not to read out the option of don't know).

The next question asks about participation, again with response options of yes, no, don't know:

- “Have you spent time actually doing any creative, artistic, theatrical or musical activities, or any crafts in the last 12 months?”

The final question is again a supplementary, asked only of those people

responding yes to the participation questions, and asking how many times, with the same response options of one, two, three or more, don't know.

These questions make up the totality of the cultural question set within the Active People Survey. It is worth noting that the questions relating to physical activity and sport go into much greater detail, so for example there are five separate questions for walking, starting with a question about whether the respondent has done at least one continuous walk of 5 minutes or more (not including shopping) during the past four weeks, then asking whether they have done at least one continuous walk of at least 30 minutes in the past four weeks, then how many days they walked at least 30 minutes in the past four weeks, then the pace of the walking, and finally the purpose of the walking (simply recreational or as transport). The last set of questions in the survey overall ask for demographic information: age, ethnicity, age of completing education and educational attainment; status of accommodation; access to a car or van; whether they have any long-term illness, disability or infirmity (sic), working status, and address.

With such a limited question set it is difficult to draw much from the questions themselves, other than that they are very clearly linked back to the National Indicator set. There is no attempt to go below the top-line data needed for the national indicators, other than the two questions relating to the separation of arts engagement into attendance and participation. This lack of detail makes it impossible to see themes within the questions themselves as carried out above for the Taking Part Survey. To understand the relative importance in policy terms of this very limited question set, it will be important to understand the differences

between this and the Taking Part Survey, both in terms of the survey goals, and the way in which the survey data was used.

5.4 Conclusion

The analysis of two surveys has thrown up a set of themes for further investigation, starting with definitions of what does and does not count as an arts activity and how these came about, the naturalisation of engagement as divided into the two components of participation and attendance, and what this says about the way in which the role and associated impact of engagement is understood (contrasting with the measurement of sports engagement, which focuses entirely on participation); geography and the role of physical space, present in the form of particularly defined places for cultural encounters, but free floating, only marginally related back to the geography of the respondent and leaving out engagement that does not require attendance in a particular kind of location; the implicit role of funding and how its absence from the survey came about, given the stated purpose of the survey to understand the impact of government funding; and finally the associated invisibility of questions of artistic quality, given its importance in decisions relating to the distribution of Arts Council funding. There is much less to take out of the Active People Survey, however as I will discuss in Chapter Nine, the combination of the two datasets became a powerful policy tool, one which was heavily inflected by the absence from both surveys of clear links between ways in which cultural activities are defined and delivered, and their take up by the public.

These themes all feed back into an overarching focus on the role of the funding structure that underpinned the development of the survey, asking to what

extent that structure was implicated in the construction of the question set at the heart of the Taking Part Survey. This takes me forward into the next four Chapters, which consider the history of the Arts Council and its relationship with its funder, central government, in order to identify the moments at which questions and decisions relating to the identified themes become visible and explicit, starting with the period from the formation of the Arts Council through to the 1965 White Paper.

6. The Conditions of Possibility

6.1 Introduction

This Chapter takes a step back in time to focus on an analysis of material generated by the Arts Council of Great Britain, and Arts Council England covering the period from the formation of CEMA (The Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts) through to the 1965 white paper *A Policy for the Arts*. The reason for choosing this particular location for my empirical work is embedded in the position developed across Chapters Two to Four, and the need to take an archaeological and genealogical study of the policy landscape in which ‘the arts’ developed.

It is here I that I start to look for the development of the themes that emerged through the analysis of the sample surveys. I begin by briefly addressing the background to the establishment of the Arts Council via CEMA. This has been written about extensively elsewhere (see for example Sinclair 1995), so I do not replicate that work, and it is included simply to set the scene for what comes next. By 1965 and the white paper, I demonstrate the development of a unified narrative for the role of state funding for the arts, managed through the prism of the Arts Council, and accompanied by the development of organisational structures which hold that narrative in place.

Despite the lack of explicit policies for the arts discussed in Chapter Four (see for example Selwood, 2006), by 1965 there is a clear and definitive

understanding of the role of both the Arts Council and state funding for the arts, with a very robust organisational structure holding it in place. Following my theoretical Chapters I suggest this can be seen as a stable assemblage, one which has effectively worked itself into a triple lock, which I refer to as an arts funding assemblage.

What I am looking for in my analysis is those points where there was space for flexibility, moments of fluidity, during which the moves that eventually solidified into that arts funding assemblage could take place. I use the framing from the interrogation of the sample surveys to focus my attention, so am looking for places where questions and decisions around art-form definitions, geography, quality, delivery (who is providing the activities), funding, and policy are made visible.

My primary sources are published policy statements, reports, and the Annual Reports and Accounts of the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB), and its successor, Arts Council England (ACE). I look at both at the policy statements and actions, and at the structure and operation of the Arts Council. I treat these documents both as material culture and as inscription devices. They are performative artefacts. At the time of their production, they were for the most part, the only published public reports on the activities of the Arts Council. Their provenance and the accuracy of the factual information they contain is undisputed, and the complete series of Annual Reports is publicly available. I use them to consider how the organisation as a whole chose to describe itself in the public domain, and to look for traces relating to the role of organisational structures in shaping the development of operations. I pay particular attention to

these moments, and the detail of the actions that take place. I look both at the visible, the stated policies and actions of the developing organisation; and at the structural, the way in which the organisation was managed, which I will argue is where much of the lock resides.

The Annual Reports and Accounts provide a yearly snapshot into the priorities and interests of the Arts Council of Great Britain. Reading them chronologically and in close succession is akin to time-lapse photography, providing an unplanned for sense of both movement and stasis over time. Although the reports are for the Arts Council of Great Britain, the reports and accounts for England, Scotland and Wales are presented separately within the overall documents, and this study focuses on the reports and accounts for England only.

The reports follow an accepted pattern for Annual Reports and Accounts, with an opening section providing a narrative report on the year, followed by the audited annual accounts. The very constraint of this pattern provides a remarkable resource for interrogation. They are robust and authoritative documents, and the facts they contain can be taken as accurate. At the same time, they are inscription devices, following the description and discussion set out in Chapter Three. As mentioned above, there is much to be garnered from reading the documents as a time series, and the analysis below tracks narrative themes and concepts over time, as they are performed in and out of being, and in and out of visibility.

I look for the development of themes and concepts through the texts of the reports, and consider how, once established, they start to lose their initial nuance, and become place-holders within the developing structure. I use the titles,

headings, and sub-headings within the text to identify these themes and refer to the text to illustrate the work taking place to naturalise the conditions of possibility for public funding. Similarly, I look at the financial information both as a factual record, showing the changing distribution of funds, and as performance through consideration of the changing categories. Again, this foregrounds the performativity of the categories, as they move, disappear and re-appear within the accounts. The comparison of the narrative and financial elements of the reports, and the differences between them, provides an additional route to track performativity across the reports and in this Chapter I follow this process in detail for the example of music. It also draws very much on the cultural economy position outlined in Chapter Four above, and through a constant focus on the relationship between text and accounting seeks to resituate the processes of funding as an inherent part of the narrative.

6.2 Inception to the 1965 White Paper

The place I am going to go start is the formation in 1940 of CEMA, the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. Arguably, this is the first institution with a national responsibility for the arts (see, for example, Gray 2010). At the start of this period, state funding for the arts is very new, there is a high level of experimentation and testing of different possibilities for the ways in which that state funding could be used to support cultural activity, and there is little in the way of formal structure.

CEMA objectives were stated as follows:

- a) The preservation in wartime of the highest standards in the arts of music, drama and painting;

- b) The widespread provision of opportunities for hearing good music and the enjoyment of the arts generally for people, who, on account of wartime conditions, have been cut off from these things;
- c) The encouragement of music-making and play-acting by the people themselves;
- d) Through the above activities, the rendering of indirect assistance to professional singers and players who may be suffering from a wartime lack of demand for their work.

Within these objectives, it is possible to see reflections of the themes identified in the sample surveys: standards (quality), widespread provision (accessibility), opportunities for hearing and enjoyment (attendance), and the encouragement of music-making and play-acting by the people themselves (participation). The only objective not possible to match up to the sample surveys is the indirect assistance for professional artists.

The initial membership of its governing Council gives a flavour of its positioning as an organisation: Lord Macmillan (Minister of Information and Chairman of the Pilgrim Trust), Dr Thomas Jones (Secretary of the Pilgrim Trust, a charitable trust set up to preserve the heritage and social culture of Great Britain), Kenneth Clarke (Director of the National Gallery), Sir Henry Walford Davies (Master of the King's Musick), W E Williams (Secretary of the British Institute of Adult Education), Dr Lawrence du Garde Peach, Dr Reginald Jacques, and Mary Glasgow. The make-up of the Council is strongly focused on appropriately qualified and recognised experts in established Western European high arts, with some additional representation for adult education and the

amateur arts. The Governing Council structure in itself was not at all innovative: the process of establishing a body made up of what would be appropriately qualified experts very much replicates the model used at the time by the Pilgrim Trust and the National Gallery, and therefore would have been very familiar to its participants. Very rapidly, in addition to the core Council, honorary Directors were appointed to take the lead in specific areas of music, professional drama, amateur drama, and art.

For the first two years of its existence, the activities delivered by CEMA focused on the widespread provision of the arts, presenting activity in those areas of Great Britain that did not otherwise have regular access to arts activities, including concerts in factories and village halls, and touring art exhibitions. Regional offices were established, following the footprint of the defence regions, each with an officer and two assistants and they started to build relationships with music societies, drama societies and other local arts groups. Professional artists were provided with work through the delivery programme. Much of the activity was delivered directly by CEMA, or in partnership with local associations and groups, who would then pay for the services of professionals. However, it was a young and very malleable organisation. The idea of a state supported national body for the promotion of the arts was very new, and the focus on participation and engagement in areas with limited access to arts activity, although clearly stated within the objectives, was not securely established as core to its role. This highly fluid environment opened the way for different positions of the role of the state in the arts to take hold. The fluidity did not last, and over a relatively short period of time the hinterland which developed around

the role of the state in supporting the arts moved entirely over to the professional fine arts, and over time, traces of that early activity largely disappeared from the established narrative.

Much has been written about the significant role of Maynard Keynes in the early development of the Arts Council of Great Britain (see for example Sinclair, 1992, Hutchison 1982) and I do not want to duplicate that work, however it is important to note that Keynes brought his considerable personal and political influence to bear in the very early stages of this story. Keynes' role was of a short duration: he became the chair of CEMA in 1942 and was instrumental in the decision to establish it as the Arts Council of Great Britain at the end of the war and would have been the first chairman under its new Royal Charter if he had not died in early 1946. Despite this relatively short involvement, his influence on the early formation of the structure that became the Arts Council cannot be over-estimated. He had extensive personal links with the intellectuals who championed the particular version of culture discussed in Chapter One. He had the capacity to influence national government, and was strongly allied with London based professional arts, particularly opera and ballet. That the Arts Council was established at all, and certainly the form of the Royal Charter, can largely be attributed to Keynes. In theoretical terms, Keynes can be seen as an example of Foucault's eventalisation in action. His deep links with the Bloomsbury group and his marriage to a Russian ballerina, as discussed in Chapter One, were historically contingent, even accidental and yet without their influence, or the impact of the Second World War, his own capacity as a world renowned economist to effect change in relation to central government policy

would not have had the same outcome for 'the arts'

6.3 The First Royal Charter of the Arts Council of Great Britain

The role of Keynes is reflected in the change of tone between the objectives of CEMA and the wording of the Royal Charter of the new organisation. The objects of the Council as quoted in the second Annual Report (1946-47) were to:

“develop “a greater knowledge, understanding and practice of the fine arts... and in particular to increase the accessibility of the fine arts to the public...and to improve the standard of execution of the fine arts and to advise and co-operate with...Government Departments, local authorities and other bodies on any matters concerned directly or indirectly with those objects.” (p.8).

The charter text itself also mentions accessibility 'throughout Our Realm', but that is absent from text as recounted in the first Annual Report (1945-46) where it states:

“When Lord Keynes met the Press, on the day that the future was announced, he told them that no big changes would take place and that the Council's established purpose held good: to encourage the best British national arts, everywhere, and to do it as far as possible by supporting others rather than setting up state-run enterprises.” (p.6).

In practical terms, the activity on the ground might well have continued as before, but the terms of the charter clearly moved the territory of the emerging organisation. Comparing the objects of CEMA and the objects of the Royal Charter directly shows up the movement from music, drama and painting to fine

arts, and the disappearance of amateur activity from the text. The importance of this change of emphasis plays out in the reports and accounts over the next two decades.

The Charter also sets out the organisation of the Arts Council of Great Britain. It starts with the Council itself, brought forward from CEMA, (with the Chancellor of the Exchequer responsible for appointments). The whole Council was to have no more than sixteen members and meet at least four times a year, with business of managing the organisation delegated to its Executive Committee. Most important for this story is clause 13.1 of the charter.

“The Council may appoint panels (consisting of such member or membership of the Council and such other persons as the Council think fit) to advise upon the general promotion of all or any one or more of the objects of the Council”.

This formalises the sub-committees first introduced under CEMA, and structured as follows: music, drama and art. I explore the critical importance of the art-form and the advisory panel structure below.

6.4 The Annual Reports

There are no separate policy documents produced during this period, so the texts of the Annual Reports are the clearest articulation of the public position of the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB, herein referred to as the Arts Council). The first six reports, until 1951, have no title other than as the numbered Annual Report and Accounts, and follow a very standard model, with a general statement of the year's activity, divided into an introduction and then sections devoted to

each art-form (I explore the concept of the art-form in more detail below), with the audited accounts following at the end. These early 'notes of the year' are descriptive in tone. They begin to demonstrate the specificity of the way in which the broad descriptors of music, drama and art are being used: very rapidly, they start to focus on the trajectories of individual companies and organisations, which make up the structure of the art-form sections. From 1952 onwards, the documents acquire an additional title, and an accompanying opening essay, which steps beyond the descriptive nature of the 'notes' and takes on the role of an advocacy tool, carrying out work to naturalise the position of the Arts Council in relation to its funding. The first ten titles, listed below, gives a vivid snapshot of the prevailing internal position:

- 1951-1952: The Arts in Great Britain
- 1952-1953: The Public and the Arts
- 1953-1954: Public Responsibility for the Arts
- 1954-1955: Housing the Arts
- 1955-1956: The First Ten Years
- 1956-1957: Art in the Red
- 1957-1958: A New Pattern of Patronage
- 1958-1959: The Struggle for Survival
- 1959-1960: The Priorities of Patronage
- 1960-1961: Partners in Patronage

These titles provide clear evidence that by the end of the first decade of the Arts Council, funding had taken on a primary importance.

6.5 Art Form Definitions

The first theme from the surveys that I explore is that of the art-form definition. The art-form appears early on as a fundamental structuring principle of the Arts Council. It should be noted that the use of the phrase art-form is somewhat different to its use in general parlance, with a very specific set of meanings which develop over time. I start with a general discussion of the development of the art-form as a inscription device, and then look in more detail at the trajectory of one art-form, music, to give a practical illustration of the device at work.

CEMA established the idea of sub-committees to structure its activity very early in its short lifespan, to keep the work load of each committee to a manageable level. It is possible to imagine a number of different structuring principles that could have equally reflected the stated objectives of CEMA at that point, for example geography, with regionally focused sub-committees; or having one sub-committee focus on amateur and another on professional activity. The choice however was to structure by art-form. This very simple move of delineating the sub-committees by artistic practice started the process of separating out and foregrounding the art-form as the primary mechanism for structuring and understanding the work of the Arts Council, and I highlight it as another example of eventalisation, a fluid moment when the historically contingent conditions in place could have led to a very different outcome. When they were initially established under CEMA the art-form committees were true sub-committees with delegated decision-making powers. This changed, still under CEMA, when they lost their decision-making powers and were re-named as Advisory Panels, making recommendations back to the main Council, which then took any formal decisions. This apparently simple organisational shift made

it possible for people who might receive funds from CEMA, in other words professional artists, to sit on those panels, as they would then only be making recommendations, not taking decisions on funding. I identify this as a crucial event in the development of the triple lock, as it changes the balance of experts sitting on the panels and shifted them from a clearly delineated governance space into a territory between governance and operation. These two factors, the structuring by art-form, and the appointment of practicing art-form experts, were fundamental to the way in which the representations of the out-there realities developed by the panels were able to develop a sustainable hinterland.

So, by the point at which the Arts Council proper came into existence in April 1946, it had already been established that the primary categorisation of its work was by art-form; that detailed work in relation to the art-forms took place through advisory panels; and that the art-form advisory panels should be made up primarily of professionals recognised as leading in that particular field. The following quote, taken from the 1st Annual Report (1945-46) of Arts Council Great Britain, makes this clear:

“The parliamentary announcement about the future included the news of the appointment of increased panels for Music and Drama. For some reason, the membership of both had dwindled, and their usefulness with it, while Art remained vigorous and effective. The new members were drawn deliberately from the companies and other enterprises most closely associated with the Council, and the result has been a series of full, lively meetings, the recommendations of which have been of the greatest possible service to the Council. Increasing value is attached to the time,

thought and practical help devoted to Arts Council affairs by these many distinguished professional men and women.” (p.5).

The practical choice of people with professional expertise able to contribute to the primary focus of the panels appears a sensible decision. However, as with the decision to foreground art-forms through the structuring of the panels, populating their membership with professional specialists from within the art-form categories moves this further into a more permanent commitment (or lock), as their knowledge and interests reinforce the naturalisation of art-form as the primary structuring principle for the activities of the Arts Council. The developing operational structure of the Arts Council was then also tied to the Advisory Panels, with paid directors responsible for each panel coming forward into the new organisation from their roles within CEMA. As noted above, the Annual Reports of the Arts Council take the art-form delineations as a core structuring mechanism from the outset, with separate sections for each art-form, following on from the overarching ‘Notes for the Year’ (this continues until the 19th Annual Report, 1963-64).

A close reading of the structuring and content of the art-form sections of the reports opens out the internal definition of each art-form, demonstrating that within each art-form heading, the reports rapidly focus down on to the activities of the individual funded organisations, and thus the broad nomenclature becomes attached to a small set of organisations, delivering a sub-set of the range of the realm of possible activities implicit within the section titles. An equally critical part of this structuring is the alignment of budgets to the panels. The Annual Report for 1945 shows that the income and expenditure account is

set out under the art-form panel headings: music, drama, and art. Sub-headings under each art-form show the detailed split into grants, guarantees, and directly supported activity, as well as naming the individual organisations in receipt of grants, but the top-line headings are established as the art-forms.

So, having started with art-form led sub-committees, the Arts Council rapidly developed an art-form driven operational structure. With the budgets, the directors, and the advisory panels came the formation of the departments and staff teams organised to manage the art-forms, and increasingly to manage the relationships with the small group of funded organisations delivering the art-form activity. This inevitably led to a continuous deepening and refinement of the institutional commitment to the art-form as its primary structuring principle, as the knowledge and expertise of the staff body focused in on the process of supporting their art-form specialist funded organisations. The accounts provide evidence of the structuring of the staff into the art form specialisms: until the 1951-2 accounts, the cost of staff salaries is directly allocated under the art-form headings alongside the grants; from 1952-53 these are moved out into a separate schedule listing the operating costs of the Arts Council, and following schedule 4 through from this point to the 1964 accounts shows that the staff structure continues to be organised around the art-forms, with the 1964 salary costs divided across *Music, Drama, Art, Finance, Administration*.

This organisational relationship between art-form and administration means that other potential topics of interest, even when explicitly identified in the reports as areas of interest to the Arts Council, were not able to generate a sufficient hinterland within the Arts Council to establish a permanent home within the

increasing robust arts funding assemblage. The themes identified through the analysis of the Taking Part Survey are visible only in relation to the art-forms and the fortunes of the individual organisations funded under the art-forms, appearing and disappearing as their relative importance waxes and wanes. They are not able to make a firm purchase within the organisation and, without associated staff and a budget, cannot make consistent headway, or make the case for their continuation. To bring these points to life, I explore in more detail the workings of one art-form heading, music.

6.5.1 Exploring Music as an Arts Council Art form through the Annual Report and Accounts 1945-1964

I explore this early period through a detailed discussion of one art-form, music. This shows the extent to which an individual art-form is subject to a much more detailed definition than is immediately visible from its Arts Council label. Starting with the accounts, I take two routes to analyse the accounts, the categories and headings used, and the amounts of funding awarded to each heading. The detailed analyses are set out in Appendix Three, which shows the year by year change in the accounts structure relating to music expenditure.

The first point to note from the accounts is that the fundamental organising principle is by art-form, with a relative fluidity in the early years, working towards a much higher level of stability at the end of the period. The top-level category starts out as 'Music', changes into 'Music and Opera' then separates out into 'Opera and Ballet' and 'Music', before finally returning to 'Music' with three stable

sub-headings visible in the schedule: 'Opera and Ballet', 'Symphony Orchestra' and 'Other Activities'. Within each sub-heading are further divisions into 'Grants and Guarantees' and then various categories of direct expenditure.

Already, the accounts have carried out significant work to build the conditions of possibility for an arts funding assemblage. Firstly, by using the art-form as their structuring principle, the published accounts provide no scope to analyse expenditure by geography (other than at the highest level, with England separated out from Scotland and Wales). This has already put in place limits to what can be seen: no attention is drawn to the lack of geographic analysis, it is simply subsumed within the available data, and consideration of the way in which spending is distributed across England is not possible in the context of these accounts.

In relation to the specific art-form category, 'Music', there is further work taking place, exemplified by the stabilised sub-headings of 'Opera and Ballet' and 'Symphony Orchestras', which dominate the expenditure: these two categories, by the end of the period, represent the vast majority of expenditure on 'Music', and thus further shape the way in which expertise develops within the Arts Council in order to support the effective management of those grants.

Further analysis of the two sub-headings shows significant activity over the period. 'Opera and Ballet' does not exist as its own category at the outset, with Opera starting under 'Music' and ballet not visible at all, then Opera appears alongside 'Music', in 'Music and Opera' (opera as both music and not music), before emerging as the combined 'Opera and Ballet', starting off a separate heading to 'Music' but finally coming to rest as a sub-heading of 'Music'. The

most interesting element of this process is the incorporation of ballet under 'Music'. It should be noted that no other dance category is visible in these early accounts and given the relationship between the Royal Ballet and the Covent Garden Opera Company (both housed in the same building, then and now), it makes practical sense to combine the expenditure in the accounts, leading to the creation of the heading 'Opera and Ballet'. There are similarities between the opera and ballet, but there are other combinations which could have worked equally well, if the operational link was not there. Ballet could be described as a form of drama. It could have been positioned under a separate 'Dance' category. This starts to highlight the malleability of the category of art-form, and how it can be shaped to fit the available space: ballet becomes allied with opera and then accepted as a part of 'Music' for practical operational reasons.

Looking further in, the detail of the structure demonstrates and reflects the Arts Council focus on working through third parties: grants and guarantees to organisations represent the vast bulk of the activity, and over the period in question the layout of the accounts provides very limited space or visibility for directly delivered activity. The honourable exceptions are the directly provided concerts, and an analysis of spend on 'directed provided concerts' provides a very clear example of the firming up of the arts funding assemblage: in 1945 CEMA spent £40,772 on directly providing concerts to take place in factories and hostels, and a further £15k on its regional concert programme. At the time this was well over double the amount allocated to Symphony Orchestras. The total treasury grant in that year was £175,000 so the provision of directly provided concerts in factories and hostels represented a significant proportion of the total

expenditure. By the end of the period under discussion in this Chapter, directly provided concerts (other than Opera for All with a grant of £7,525, out of a total spend on Music of £1,644,219) had completely disappeared.

What can be seen in the accounts is both a growth in total funding and a shift in the way the funds are being spent. Covent Garden makes its first appearance in the accounts in 1946, with £25,000, just over 10% of the total Treasury grant; by 1952 it receives £150,000, 26% of the Treasury grant, and by 1963 it is receiving 31.5% of the total grant in aid, with Opera and Ballet as a category totalling just over 52% of the total grant in aid. By 1964 Covent Garden is receiving nearly thirty-four times its original grant. Spending on Symphony Orchestras does not grow on the same scale but does increase to approximately fourteen times its 1945 grant of £18,471. During the same time frame, both the funding for factories and hostels programme and for Industrial Music Clubs ceased, with the only directly funded activity as discussed above, provided by Opera for All. The total budget for all Other Activities in 1964 is slightly less than the amount for Directly Provided Concerts in 1945.

The narrative text follows a similar trajectory: under the heading 'Music' in the 1945 report are sub-headings: *Change-over from War to Peace, Industrial Music, Wales, Music Clubs, Orchestras, Opera v Ballet*; whereas the 1950-51 report has sub-headings (in this order) for: *symphony orchestras, chamber and string orchestras, the national federation of music societies, other clubs and societies, directly provided concerts, special groups, gramophone library, and Help for Young Artists*. The inscription goes further in, with the text of 1950-51 sub-heading on symphony orchestras only discussing the four orchestras funded by

the Arts Council in England, and the Scottish National Orchestra. By 1962-63, the year before the White Paper, the sub-headings are *The Orchestra Scene, City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra, Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra, Halle Orchestra, Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra, London Philharmonic Orchestra, London Philharmonic Society, London Symphony Orchestra, Northern Sinfonia Orchestra, Chamber Orchestras, Royal Philharmonic Society, Brighton Philharmonic Society, National Federation of Music Societies, Other Musical Activities.*

The 1945 headings cover a range of different categories, at a policy level (the change from war to peace), considering distribution routes and geography (industrial concerts, Wales), and different music traditions (orchestras, opera v ballet); by 1951 these have shifted, both in their ordering (art-forms come first) and their focus, with much more emphasis on a limited range of music genres, and the specific organisations within those genres that are funded by the Arts Council.

By 1963, the focus is almost wholly on that sub-set of identified producing organisations, with only the National Federation of Music Societies still providing a place marker for distribution. This process of 'looking up and centring', taking a discrete and limited set of activities, in this case an identified set of organisations producing music within a specific genre, and according them the collective title 'Music', is a crucial part of the process of inscription. The space for discussion or reflection on any aspect of 'Music', or the recognition that the word Music has a broader reach than the specific organisations funded by the Arts Council, is being lost. At the same time, within the context of the reports, the

word 'Music' is starting to take on the particular reality of 'music producing entities funded by the Arts Council'.

Thus, by 1964 the art-form, Music, within the context of the Arts Council, has become a sub-set of the range of possibilities suggested by that word. Funds for 'Opera and Ballet' and 'Symphony Orchestras', which have increased many times between 1945 and 1964, are focused on a handful of professional organisations, numbering no more than twenty, the majority funded year on year, and based either in London, or other major centres of population. The remainder of the funding for 'Music', which covers all other activity, including support for the smaller scale, and amateur, has remained static over the twenty years. Encased within the use of the word Music as an Arts Council art-form, is the stripping out of the amateur and of participatory activity; of traditions of music outside the specific Western European cadre of opera, orchestral, chamber and other classical music forms; and of localities outside the major metropolitan centres.

6.6 Funding: could there ever be enough

Having started with the art-form definition as the fundamental organising principle, the next theme that needs to be introduced is that of funding, reflecting its visibility and persistence throughout all the Annual Reports of this period. The consistent message in relation to overall funding is that there isn't enough. This appears early and continues throughout this whole period. This is a little surprising, given that prior to the establishment of CEMA there had been almost no public funding for arts activity.

Already by the third Annual Report (1947-48) the optimism of two years previously, when the charter was announced, has shifted: "In many fields the

Council's programme was limited by lack of funds and the demand for assistance remained too large for the Council to meet" (p.6, 1948). The fourth Annual Report (1948-49) expands on the matter, which at the same time as acknowledging a significant increase in funding, argues that there is not enough to meet demand:

"The Council's grant-in-aid from the Exchequer for the financial year 1948-9 was £575,000. This showed an increase of £147,000 on the previous year, most of which was devoted to Opera and Ballet and to Drama.

The general rise in costs and in wages led to widely increased demands for assistance from the larger organisations such as the Old Vic, Sadler's Wells and Covent Garden, and the Council did its best to meet these claims. It agreed to concentrate on the needs of its old-established companies rather than to allow its limited funds to be dispensed in new directions. This meant a number of inevitable refusals to applicants with strong and acceptable cases." (p.7, 1949).

What is clearly visible here is the developing relationship between the available funds and the decisions that are being taken about what to fund. The moves made in this early period, when there was the potential for flexibility, had a very long impact, both in relation to how future funds were distributed, but also in terms of how the Arts Council understood its role in relation to the arts. The choice visible in the statement above was to concentrate on a small number of named organisations. These 'old-established companies' had at this point only been receiving regular support for a very few years, with Covent Garden only funded from 1946, three years before this report. However, the impact of the

existence of the Arts Council and the subsequent availability of state funding, was already showing in the way that those organisations had begun to structure themselves around the availability of that funding. This early development of an Arts Council shaped client organisation is a crucial moment in the development of the arts funding assemblage.

The seventh Annual Report (1951-52), the first to have a title and an opening essay, sets out the understanding of the Arts Council in relation to the role of state funding for the arts, and two paragraphs in particular, headed in turn 'Art and Economics' and 'The Price of Diffusion', are worth noting in full because of the intensive work taking place within in them. When read from a 2018 perspective the text can appear wholly uncontroversial, but at the time of writing, both the case for public funding of the arts and the role of that funding were very new and these paragraphs provide an early articulation of what went on to become a naturalised position. As I move further through the chronology, statements such as these disappear from the reports as their position becomes an accepted part of the conditions for possibility in relation to state funding of the arts.

"Art and Economics

Why do the arts need any subsidy at all? Some of them, such as Grand Opera, demand a scale of presentation which the box-office alone cannot maintain even when the house is full. There is, of course, such a commodity as 'utility opera' which could, until recently, make ends meet; but Grand Opera of high quality has never been an economic proposition in any country... A National Theatre too, even in embryo, is another kind

of art which requires patronage. Such an establishment deliberately accepts risks beyond those of the commercial theatre. It must provide for example, a repertory of the classics in which some plays are bound to draw the public more than others...A National Theatre must preserve the heritage of traditional drama and, at the same time, provide the opportunity for experiment. Its functions can to some extent be revealed by the following comparison. The big industries are willing to endow applied science in the reasonable expectation of being requited by discoveries profitable to their trade. The Universities, on the other hand, endow and sustain pure science so as to enlarge the boundaries of scientific knowledge. A National Theatre, by this parallel, pursues the aim of the University rather than that of big business, and must in the same sense be economically 'unprofitable'...

The Price of Diffusion

Another reason why the arts must be subsidized – and a reason more cogent nowadays than it used to be – is in order that they may be to some extent enjoyed by the inhabitants of small towns and rural areas. But the cost of diffusing the arts, even on a modest compass, is very heavy and increasingly uneconomic. The largest concentration of the arts must inevitably be built up at the big centres of population, and the proper place for the best national assemblies of the arts is the capital city of the country. The diffusion of the arts must be limited by many factors – by the high cost of mobile operations, by the dearth of proper theatres, galleries and concert halls, and by the availability of good pictures, good orchestras, and

good actors. Moreover, there exists in the B.B.C. a most potent agency of diffusion which brings many of the arts in their highest forms to the fireside of every cottage. Yet taking all these considerations into account, the citizen of the Welfare State is entitled to expect the arts to be distributed as widely as is reasonably possible.” (*The Arts in Great Britain The Seventh Annual Report of the Arts Council of Great Britain 1951-52* pp 3-5).

Looking at the detail of these two paragraphs, what is taking place is the foregrounding of the set of principles being developed by the Arts Council to underpin its funding decisions. In the first paragraph, the argument that the professional, large scale and high quality (leaving questions of what is implied by quality for later) must be funded is set out, on the basis that they cannot exist at the required level on door takings alone. The hinterland behind investment in science and Universities is co-opted to support this position. On the other hand, the second sets out the argument that the equally uneconomic process of touring arts, should not be funded more than ‘is reasonably possible’. An economic argument is used in both directions: it is not independently sustainable; therefore, we must fund it, and it is not independently sustainable therefore we must curtail our funding.

Here, it is possible to see the practical way in which the wording of the Royal Charter, with its focus on fine arts and quality, has enmeshed with the operational structure of the Advisory Panels and the Art Form departments and their increasing expert focus on working with and supporting the large scale national, and mainly London based, arts organisations, to arrive at a position where the

same argument about affordability is used on the one hand to make the case for subsidy in relation for the largely London based national companies, and on the other, to reduce subsidy to regional and touring work.

There are two important points to pick up here, the first in relation to the development of a stable assemblage, the second in relation to cultural economy. The arts funding assemblage is starting to take shape: experts are building their knowledge in relation to the art-forms and activities that can be delivered by large scale organisations of the kind that exist in major centres of population; their representation of the world starts to have an effect on the possible realities 'out-there', seen in the development of Arts Council client organisations which depend on Arts Council funding to exist. The advocacy necessary at this relatively early stage in order to develop a stable hinterland is clearly visible in the statements above, which are working hard to naturalise the idea that high quality large scale work can only be delivered with subsidy, and that it is ideally delivered in the capital. The smaller scale, touring work loses out because it does not have the advocates and networks necessary to develop or co-opt a sufficient hinterland in order to fasten itself into the assemblage. The early loss of geography as an organising principle is already making itself felt.

Turning now to cultural economy, the role of the economic is explicit in the quotes above, working inseparably from the aesthetic in such a way that the economic argument can be used both ways, on the one hand to increase, and on the other to reduce funding, because of their relative positions within the assemblage. Here is a clear example of the way in which the economic is inextricably linked into the assemblage (i.e. following the position set out by

DuGay and Pryke (2002)): in other words, the implicit policy of the time could not simply draw on the aesthetic, but also had to draw on the economic.

The position in relation to availability of funding is repeated throughout the next eleven annual documents: there isn't enough money and therefore the Arts Council needs to curate the available funds very carefully. It is not possible to achieve both quality and diffusion within the available funds, and therefore they must concentrate on quality. Questions of geographic spread and distribution are left to one side as too expensive. The impact of this position is not only one of funding, but also of organisational structure, knowledge and competencies, as the Arts Council structure continues to evolve and refine in response to its self-identified role. This further embeds the triple lock as the representations generated by the expert Arts Council staff, employed to deliver on the stated goals of the Council, continue to build a stable hinterland for their particular reality.

6.7 Adopting the role of Patron

The 8th Annual Report (1952-53) foregrounds of the word patronage, with the opening essay titled 'A Pattern for Patronage'. Patronage then continues to appear in the reports throughout this period, making the link between an imagined historic model of private patronage for the arts, drawing on the particular view of culture outlined in Chapter One, of heroic individuals championing the arts (in this case through financial support), and this new model of state patronage, with the public patron now standing in for that private patron. This is a further co-option of an existing hinterland, that of the private patron, an identity which is developed within the report texts, for example the eleventh

Annual Report (1955-56) states:

“Such expensive arts as these have never paid their way, and have depended for their existence in the past upon the bounty of private patrons. In almost every country the private patron is rare and poorer than he was even 30 years ago, and most nations have accepted the obligation to replace private by collective or public patronage through rates and taxes”
(p. 30-31)

A comparison with this statement from the fifteenth Annual Report (1959-60) shows how this argument has been developed and linked to other forms of public funding:

“Collective patronage of this kind is by no means a recent phenomenon of our society. It is more than a century since Public libraries were accepted as a charge upon the rate; art galleries and museums have for decades been provided and subsidized by municipal funds. The evolution of our public education system, moreover, is a progressive acceptance of the principle that knowledge should be universally provided at the public expense...The principle instrument of public patronage in Britain is the Arts Council. Its policy has inevitably been governed to a large extent by its financial resources, a factor which is frequently overlooked by bodies which fail to secure a grant. With only 7d a head to spend it is bound to be rigorously selective in its benefactions, and its constant endeavour is, first of all, to identify and sustain its primary obligations, and, that be done, to offer what can often be no more than a token acknowledgement of its secondary obligations...It regards its major responsibility as being to

maintain in the metropolis a few national institutions: Covent Garden Opera, the Royal Ballet, Sadler's Wells Opera and the Old Vic." (p.6-7)

Again, the text demonstrates the co-opting of other hinterlands to bolster the position for public funding of the arts, in this case libraries and public education. Here, the characterisation of public funding as patronage, making a link between the imagined historic role of private patrons and public investment, is used to anchor the role of the Arts Council as primarily responsible for supporting the existence of the 'national institutions' of the fine arts, as would have been the role of the private patron; rather than developing a new purpose, visible in both the objectives of CEMA and in the Royal Charter, of providing a model of widespread provision and public engagement with the arts. The statement above demonstrates how quickly the arts funding assemblage became fixed into a particular location, with the role of patron starting to frame the ways in which the funding provided by central government to the Arts Council is used, through the adoption of a responsive rather than pro-active role as primary funder for a small number of large scale London based organisations.

There is one further point to raise here: the Arts Council did not fund commercial organisations, and this is rarely mentioned in the reports. Some of the logic behind that position can be seen in the quote above on 'Art and Economics', that commercial operators have a reasonable expectation of making a financial return and therefore do not need public funds (although that could be considered a rather circular argument, particularly when the theatre companies in receipt of Arts Council funds did, from time to time, make significant profits on particular shows). As the Council increasingly focused its attention wholly onto

the organisations it funded, one consequence was the loss of visibility of the role of the commercial as well as the amateur in the way in which the arts operated in England.

As new forms of artistic activity developed outside of the relatively narrow definitions of art-form practice accepted within the assemblage, they necessarily had to develop within a more 'commercial' frame and built their existence entirely outside the relatively narrow remit of the Arts Council, both in terms of funding, and in terms of recognition as art-forms. Again, this is a practical demonstration of the role of the economic within the implicit policy position of the Arts Council, and increasingly as a fundamental part of the arts funding assemblage. Looking into the next Chapter, the impact of activity that did not fit within the assemblage becomes more visible in period post the 1964 White Paper, with the explosion of popular culture, and the resulting pressure on the Arts Council to defend its position.

6.8 To Raise or Spread, part one: what happens to Geography

The exploration of geography follows on very much from the discussion around funding. It too is visible within the narrative of reports, despite its complete absence from the accounting structure. As illustrated above in the quotes covering the impossibility of funding activity with a countrywide distribution, the two themes, funding and geography, appear almost entirely intertwined from early in the history of the Arts Council. However, there are specific additional points relevant to geography, and in particular I highlight the relationship between geography, buildings and a concept which appears regularly throughout the early reports, standards. The concept of standards was not visible in the sample

surveys, but its existence as shown through the Annual Report narratives, sheds light on the gap between the content of the sample surveys, the results, and their potential for use in policy.

As described earlier, CEMA ran a number of schemes taking activities across the country, and had a network of regional organisers, working directly with local music and arts societies. Within the first five years of the Arts Council being established, this work had been almost wholly curtailed, and by 1955, the regional offices were all closed. The rationale was both economic, that there were not enough funds to support this form of touring, and about quality, that it was only possible to support work of sufficient standard in a small number of places: the relatively weak hinterland attached to 'spread' meant that the same economic argument used to support 'raise' could be used to close down the regional operation.

What becomes clear through the texts is that the Arts Council developed the view that, although the charter described its role in two ways, both to increase accessibility and to improve standards, it placed its focus very much on the latter, with a focus on maintaining and enhancing the capacity of centres of artistic excellence. This is manifested in policy positions, which again, although not explicitly stated as such during this period, appear regularly in the annual essays and are reflected in the actions and spending decisions visible in the reports and accounts. The particular positions that appear in multiple locations are: the importance of maintaining standards within a too-small budget; the responsibility of local communities and local authorities to demonstrate their interest and support; and the importance of national organisations for the country as a whole.

The first of these positions, on funding, I have, to a large extent, already covered above, however the following quote from the 6th Annual Report (1950-51) shows just how quickly this reworking of the priorities of the charter takes place (note the subtle change of emphasis between the description of those priorities here and their original statement in the charter itself):

“The Charter of the Arts Council, however, enunciates a double purpose – (a) that the Council should seek to elevate standards of performance in the arts and (b) that it should endeavour to spread the appreciation of the arts. The Council has sought to observe both these injunctions. But the size of its budget in a period of rising costs may require it to examine how far both these objects may be simultaneously secured.” (p.31).

Patronage also makes an appearance in the 8th Annual Report (1952-53), playing a supporting role in the decision to focus resources in the metropolitan centres:

“Public patronage, whatever form it takes, must select its roles and objectives with precision – and that is one of the lessons the Arts Council is beginning to learn. It lacks the means to pursue diffusion on a massive scale, and since there exist methods more apt for diffusion than those it can command or afford, it seems wiser that the Arts Council should now concentrate its limited resources on the maintenance and enhancement of standards. If an emphasis must be placed somewhere in that motto of ‘Raise and Spread’ it seems wiser and more realistic to concentrate on Raise.” (p.12)

The second position also starts to emerge quite early, with the argument that

localities that did not sufficiently support the arts themselves, by not turning out to see their local repertory theatre, or touring performance, or by failing to use the power of the 1948 Local Government Act, which allowed local authorities to levy up to 6d for music and drama, are therefore not worthy of support from the Arts Council. The language used in the reports starts to move responsibility for the provision of provincial arts more generally away from the Arts Council and towards a combination of local authorities and local communities.

By the 8th Annual Report (1952-53), the following statement starts to make explicit the view that it is the primary responsibility of Local Authorities to support the charter mission of accessibility, now reframed into the word 'diffusion':

"But faced with the problem of choice, and a limited budget, the Arts Council must seek to consolidate rather than enlarge its own particular responsibilities to the arts in Britain. It can do so, moreover, in the solid confidence that municipal patronage is taking a large and increasing share of the cost of providing the arts to those communities which express an articulate desire to enjoy them. If local authorities will continue at the present rate to carry some of the load of diffusion there will still be an inevitable dearth of the arts, but there will be no famine. But unless high standards can be maintained in selected strongholds diffusion will be a fruitless and improvident effort" (p.13).

By the fifteenth Annual Report (1959-60), this position has become thoroughly embedded, and a secondary argument against the case for 'diffusion' starts to appear directly, arguing that areas that had not already committed their own resource were not to be considered suitable locations for the use of public funds:

“The basis of Arts Council grant policy, then, is to maintain a limited number of power-houses of music, drama, opera and ballet...Its function is to nurture the arts, not to provide popular amenities in that field. In a sense this policy has been determined by the Arts Council’s modest annual income, but even if that income were double what it is, the duty of the Arts Council would still be to nourish good standards of production and performance, rather than attempt a premature and ambitious scale of diffusion... A wider diffusion might be feasible (again if it were regarded as desirable) if Local Authorities would make a bigger contribution than they do...The case for further diffusion at present, however, is questionable. Even if the Arts Council had more money to spend it would need to ponder several other questions before deciding on extended diffusion. There are many towns which have consistently failed to reveal an interest in ‘live’ plays or concerts, and which have allowed their local repertory theatre to collapse. Is public money to be used in the long and expensive business of coaxing the cultural appetites of such places?” (p.9-10)

In other words, not only is diffusion unaffordable, but the case for using public funds to support activity in places that have not demonstrated sufficient interest in the version of the arts promoted by the Arts Council, has not been met. A discussion of the potential for Civic Trusts in ninth (1953-54) and tenth (1954-55) Annual Reports indicates that there has been some further thought about the issue of diffusion and how it could be tackled:

“No city in Britain has yet addressed itself to the task of securing a balanced and regular provision of the arts. No municipal committees or

voluntary associations exist to represent civic trusteeship for the arts as a whole, although such bodies are abundant and active in other parts of our social structure.” (*Public Responsibility for the Arts The Ninth Annual Report of the Arts Council of Great Britain 1953-54* p.9-10)

However, this is where the developing organisational structure of the Arts Council comes into play. Outside of the text of the Annual Reports, there is no consistent work carried out to understand or develop the potential of local or regional structures to support activity outside the major metropolitan centres. Ideas appear in the Report essays, but there is no movement in the allocation of staff resources or budget to take them forward. They do not fit within the work of the art-form departments, which have becoming increasingly focused on the work of specific, professional and high-profile metropolitan organisations, and therefore there is no practical way to take them forward. The developing art-form focused arts funding assemblage is beginning to demonstrate its stability.

The development of the Regional Arts Associations is a case in point: the first, the South West Regional Arts Association, developed locally in response to the closure of the Arts Council’s own regional offices, and was reactively awarded funding, which it then distributed to local art associations that were previously serviced by the regional office. It was followed in a similar fashion by the West Midlands Arts Association. The North-East Arts Association which developed next, used a very different approach, again developed locally, which brought all the local authorities across its area into a subscription model. The tone in relation to the regional associations within the Arts Council reports is one of an interested by-stander, keen to see the regional bodies developed, and happiest with the

version that brings in local authority support, but not taking an active or sustained role in any co-ordinated development. The problem that the creation of the South-Western Arts Association sought to solve, that of regional representation and support for the arts outside of a metropolitan area was already seen as one that did not belong to the Arts Council.

The third position, that of the importance of maintaining and supporting national organisations for the benefit of the cultural life of the whole country also runs through the early reports. A delightful passage in the 5th Annual Report (1949-50) brings this to life:

“...it [the Arts Council] looks forward to the re-building of the Queen’s Hall, on the combined sites of the old hall and the St George’s Hall, as an urgent necessity for the musical life of the country.” (p.14)

Here, very simply, the conflation of London and the country is writ large. How exactly the rebuilding of a concert hall in central London is going to affect the cultural opportunity of a resident of the Wirral is not in the frame. Similarly, from the 7th Annual Report (1951-52):

“The Council is chided from time to time on the grounds that it gives the arts in London far more than ‘a fair share’ of its subsidies. The Council’s normal grant expenditure for the year 1951-2 (excluding the Festival of Britain) was £449,000. Of this sum £182,000 was spent on provincial organisations and £267,000 on organisations based in London. But not all the organisations based in London are exclusively metropolitan...to debit the costs of Covent Garden, Sadler’s Wells and the Old Vic entirely to the London column of the ledger is bad book-keeping.” (p.13)

By this point, there is an emerging sense from the text that there needs to be a justification of the relative expenditure on London based versus provincial organisations (which includes organisations based in for example Birmingham), and as a result a consideration of the way in which expenditure should be allocated comes into play, with the largest grants starting to be described as national and therefore not attributable to their geographic locality.

6.9 To Raise and Spread, part two: Quality and Standards

Again, the theme of 'quality and standards' has already appeared in a supporting role, however it also deserves to be recognised in its own right. The relationship between funding, quality and standards, is one that becomes both less visible and more important over time, so that by the time of the sample surveys, the relationship has become blurred to the extent that for activity to be considered art, it needs not to be commercial.

The use of standards has previously been seen in relation to funding and geography above, summarised in the Arts Council position of 'raise rather than spread'. This quote from the 6th Annual Report (1950-51) sums up the relationship beautifully:

“High standards can be built only on a limited scale. The motto which Meleager wrote to be carved over the door of a patrician nursery might be one for the Arts Council to follow in deciding what to support during the next few straitened years – ‘Few, but roses’ – including, of course, regional roses.” (p.34)

The concept of Standards is also used to define the kinds of organisation and

activity that can be supported. Notably, the shift away from support for amateur activity is managed in relation to standards: the extended essay in the 11th Annual Report (1955-56) discusses this at length, and uses the opportunity to re-state the position of CEMA (a position which was not quite so clear from the activity of CEMA itself):

“The second conclusion which CEMA had established was the necessity to distinguish between the professional and the amateur practice of the arts. Both are supremely important, but for different reasons. The amateur practice of music or play-production or painting confers a variety of benefits on its participants. Without seeking to arrange these benefits in any order or proportion one may say they include, for instance, the therapeutic and social consequences of choral singing or oil-painting; the development of appreciation; the provision, especially in smaller communities, of concerts and plays which would be economically beyond their reach on a professional basis. On such grounds as these the amateur performance of the arts is a vital and significant element in the national provision. But very rarely is it possible for the amateur to attain professional proficiency: not through lack of talent, but through lack of time. The achievement and preservation of standards in the arts is, primarily, then, the role of the professional, just as the task of diffusing the arts outside the cities is largely the business of the amateur. The professional movement and the amateur movement are different in their needs as well as their natures; and early in its existence CEMA discovered the manifold difficulties encountered by an administrative body which seeks to act

simultaneously as the trustee for both movements. Hence its decision to withdraw virtually from the amateur field, which in fact is well organized for its specific tasks and which continues to enjoy a measure of support from the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust and other sustaining bodies.” (p.13)

This statement is carrying out a number of tasks: firstly, it allies the position of the Arts Council ten years in, to the position of its predecessor. It also explicitly recognises the value and importance of amateur activity, but crucially, argues that the amateur on the one hand does not have a role in the preservation of standards (which is the responsibility of the professional and, as we have seen above, of the Arts Council), but on the other is responsible for the availability of arts activity outside the cities. This move ties together issues of standards, geography and funding, and places the Arts Council very clearly as only responsible for city based professional activity. Even though it recognises the importance of the amateur to the overall national provision, it argues that this is best led and managed by others. In other words, the Arts Council is not responsible either for funding or for taking a strategic lead in the development of the amateur sector. This is a major shift from the position originally espoused by CEMA and visible in the activity it supported, and quite a tightening even of the terms of the Charter but presented within the text as a seamless and sensible development.

There is one more move in relation to standards, visible in the fifteenth Annual Report (1959-60):

“...the Arts Council should now concentrate its limited resources primarily, though not exclusively, on the maintenance and enhancement of

standards. Standards can be best raised in permanent centres: music and drama must have fixed abodes and local habitations where resident companies can develop their skill and esprit and sense of purpose.” (p.10)

This argument is inextricably linked with another focus of the Arts Council, ‘Housing the Arts’. However, in this context, it is using the combined standards and funding positions to limit the range of possibility for fundable organisations by excluding those that do not work from permanent centres.

6.10 Creating the Art Form Organisation

The development of a new entity, the art-form organisation, is a crucial part of this narrative. Working out from my theoretical position, and having carried out an analysis of the archive, I argue that a very specific, concrete entity has come into being, one that is distinct and requires particular attention. There are three identifiable steps involved in this process.

The first is the decision to work through external organisations, rather than through direct delivery, the second to position the Arts Council as the distributor of public patronage, in the imagined mould of the no longer existent private patron. These combine to create an arms-length two-step, firstly from the Government to the Arts Council, and secondly from the Arts Council to the organisations it funds. The Annual Reports very clearly state that there should not be a centrally set agenda, coming from St James’s Square, and it is the role of the Arts Council to respond rather than lead. This move places the locus of decision-making, beyond the broad decision to fund, not only out of the hands of the state, but also out of the hands of the Arts Council, and firmly into those funded organisations. The third step focuses in on those organisations. Very

early on, the Arts Council established that state funding should be limited to organisations with a particular set of characteristics. These have already been described across the themes above, but collectively, add up to the development of a powerful new entity. In summary, they needed to be characterised as professional, and more specifically, professional in the delivery of an art-form. They must also be non-profit, ideally constituted as a charity or a trust, with a voluntary board of trustees.

The immediate impact of this move is difficult to see, but its effect is to limit the range of possibility for the Arts Council. Because it worked through its client organisations, and those organisations could only be art-form specific not for profit organisations, delivering professional work, by the end of this first period there was no mechanism for the Arts Council to engage operationally with the commercial or amateur sectors, or with local government in ways that went beyond the specific needs of its funded clients.

6.11 Policy without ‘A Policy’

As stated earlier, the policies of the Arts Council in the period 1946 to 1964 are embedded within the Annual Reports and Accounts. There are several one-off studies carried out during the period, most notably ‘Housing the Arts’ but no overarching policy document is produced. The policy or policies of the Arts Council develop organically, playing out in the Annual Reports, particularly in the essays, and throughout this Chapter I have attempted to excavate them through close reading of those texts, highlighting approaches to funding, geography and standards.

There are displayed, within the reports and actions of the Arts Council, a set

of principles which are used to structure and shape the work of the Council: these are both visible and invisible, in that they are sometimes referred to, but mostly operate below the radar. Held across the themes outlined above is a set of moves, which I argue create a strong lock, able to hold a particular position in place in the face of a range of external pressures.

As discussed above, the decision to work through particularly defined third-party organisations, the 'art-form clients', limits the conditions of possibility for the developing Arts Council. Tracing the impact of this decision is not straightforward as there is very little discussion of any alternative. Where it does become visible is when policy initiatives appear in the Annual Reports but are not subsequently able to gain traction. For example, the repeated statements about the need for localities to step up and engage with arts provision are not backed up with any resource to turn the desire into action. The development of the Regional Arts Associations is welcomed, and they even receive some funding, but there is no concerted action to take the movement forward (at least not until after the period in question). Similar trajectories befell discussions on both local arts centres and civic arts trusts. They were interesting ideas but were not able to establish themselves within the operation of the Arts Council as they did not fit within the operational structuring around the core art-forms and their client professional organisations.

A final point in this section is the way in which the lack of a definitive policy statement beyond the bounds of those Annual Reports (a lack which feels odd in the context of contemporary managerial approaches) appears to have provided a space where actions contrary to the stated positions could be followed

at will. For example, the funding of the National Federation of Music Societies, which distributed the income to its members (amateur music societies) following a strict protocol of bids, appears at odds with the clearly articulated disavowal of the amateur, and the small scale described in the detailed analysis of 'Music' as an art-form category. Although this funding does not increase at anywhere near the same rate as for the professional companies, it is consistent, and the work of the Federation is both praised and described in some detail within the narrative reports. It is however, very much at odds with the position of the Arts Council moving away from direct involvement with the amateur arts, as the Federation was (and is) made up of a membership of amateur music societies.

6.12 Conclusion

Four of the five themes I have discussed above, funding, geography, quality and standards, and art-forms, are closely intertwined, and underpin the move from the early experimentation to the quite locked in role of the Arts Council by 1965. They work together as the Arts Council develops into the role of a patron, the primary funder for a small number of professional organisations, and, despite its protestations that it works at a distance, where that role is starting to shape the structure and operation of those client organisations and with them the art-forms they represent. The availability of significant amounts of public funding for a small number of organisations shapes their activity, a process that leads to the rapidly increasing requirement for more public funds to meet their needs. The process of art-form inscription takes categories with the potential for a broad definition and, by 1965, has arrived at a position where, as demonstrated through the detailed description in relation to Music, the art-form 'Music' has become de-

limited to particular musical genres and producers.

The fifth theme, policy, is different, and although the word is used in the text, and there are policy statements, the point is that policy does not exist outside of the text of the Annual Reports unless it is framed through the art-form departments. The focus of the art-form departments, and therefore their knowledge, competency and expertise, is on the professional organisations that take the vast majority of the funding. This is fundamental to the developing lock, as not only does it facilitate the circular funding requirements of the major client organisations described above, but the lack of policy or structures to counter-balance that process means that there is no method or mechanism for sustaining anything other.

By the mid 1960s, three entities have come to the fore and been solidified: the art-form, the not-for-profit professional art form specific arts organisation, and the Arts Council as patron. All three are at the same time a response to the structuring of the Arts Council and also crucial to the process of structuring itself. The existence of the Arts Council is visibly shaping the arts world around it, and the Arts Council is being shaped by that world in turn.

The Arts Council, operating in England, was, by 1965, firmly structured around the art-form, taking on the role of public patron of the arts, with 'the arts' understood in terms of a set of internally validated definitions of the established art-forms, meeting the conditions of Bourdieu's autonomous field. At the same time, the particular shape of the field was historically contingent, drawing on the specific pre-occupations of a particular group of people, wanting to build a post-war professional arts world in the UK which encompassed the classical

European art-forms of opera, ballet and orchestral music, operating at a comparable standard to their continental European counter-parts. Most Arts Council activity was directed towards support for organisations recognised as leading the way in art-form standards, with art-form departments at the core of its operation.

The way in which the assemblage developed meant that not only was there a distance between the Government and the Arts Council (the arms-length principle), there was a second distance between the Arts Council as patron and the organisations which received funding to carry out their activities, and this 'double' arms-length principle in combination with the three entities described above, provided a very strong lock for the arts funding assemblage in place by the end of this period. The term 'the arts' by this point contained within it all the key components of the assemblage, crucially this included not only a set of historically contingent art-form definitions and entities, but also the funding mechanisms, and the expertise to identify what should and should not be funded. This description fits the criteria for a triple lock, with the art-form experts, both within the Arts Council and in the client organisations, taking the role of researchers, those doing the knowing; the art-forms taking the role of the realities being described; and the institutional networks being the burgeoning hinterland of the professional art form client organisations, the Arts Council itself in its role as patron, and the funding it awards. And, as will be discussed in the next Chapter, the reach of the assemblage had by this point spread into the language of government.

7. Sustaining the Assemblage

7.1 Introduction

This Chapter explores the period from the 1965 publication of *A Policy for the Arts*, through to 1984, building on the conditions of possibility established in the previous Chapter. I demonstrate how the arts funding assemblage, described at the end of the previous section and which already has embedded within it the themes identified in the analysis of the Taking Part Survey, successfully sustains itself through successive periods of significant social, cultural and economic change, again using the Annual Reports and Accounts of the Arts Council as my primary source, alongside the 1965 white paper *A Policy for the Arts*. I also consider key documents commissioned by the Arts Council, including the 1974 Baldry Report into Community Arts, Naseem Khan's 1976 report *The Art Britain Ignores*, and the report into the working practices of the Arts Council published in 1979, all of which at the same time as providing challenge, continue to adhere to the stabilising organising principles of the Council.

7.2 The White Paper and beyond - into the white heat

I start with the 1965 *A Policy for the Arts*, the first time the government produced a White Paper on the arts, and the first of only two white papers ever published on arts policy in England. Led by Jennie Lee, who went on to become the first Arts Minister, the white paper marked a significant change of emphasis from government, backed up with a substantial increase to the Arts Council grant, and

a renewed Charter. I consider the white paper in detail, using it to shape the structure of this section, alongside a continuing consideration of the Annual Reports and Accounts and an increasing (if still relatively few) number of policy reports, to see how the themes identified in the previous section, the entities of the art-form and the art-form organisation, and the policies around funding, geography and standards, develop.

A Policy for the Arts provides a very tangible marker of the extent to which the Arts Council arts funding assemblage had been stabilised by 1965. All of the previously identified themes: the art-form and associated art-form organisations, funding, geography and standards make an appearance. It is the way that they appear and the intensity or otherwise of interest in how they progress that provides the insight into the ways in which the assemblage had or had not stabilised by this point.

In its introduction, the white paper addresses the question of geography:

“In some parts of the country professional companies are non-existent. Even amateurs find it hard to keep going. And a lack of suitable buildings makes it impossible to bring any of the leading national companies, orchestral, operatic, ballet or theatre, into those areas”.

This statement demonstrates an acceptance and stabilisation of the Arts Council structure of the art-form and the professional art-form organisation as the primary organising principle for artistic delivery, with the challenge specifically in relation to geographical distribution, with a desire to see a shift from the ‘raise’ of the previous twenty years, to more of a ‘spread’, and a clear direction to support the growth of activity in locations outside London. This highlighting of

geography continues throughout the white paper, with two sections entitled respectively *Local and Regional Effort* and *Housing the Arts*, the former addressing the potential of Regional Arts Associations and the role of local government and the latter looking more specifically at the provision of buildings in which arts activities could be delivered and the potential for the development of local Arts Centres, both feeding into the challenge of the distribution of activity, and from that into the identified government actions. Questions of distribution and geography remained unresolved and problematic but were now wholly enclosed within the boundaries established in relation to activities provided by professional art-form organisations.

The introduction also opens up the notion of the audience, suggesting the need to win a wider audience for the arts, and hinting at the wider societal change taking place:

“A younger generation, however, more self-confident than their elders, and beginning to be given some feeling for drama, music and the visual arts in their school years, are more hopeful material. They will want gaiety and colour, informality and experimentation”.

At the same time as picking up on the topic of audiences (one that hitherto had not found any space in the Arts Council art-form focused structure, and which, despite the White Paper, still did not find a place after 1965) this paragraph also pre-figures a debate which plays out within the Arts Council over the next twenty years: what to do with young people’s art. Despite the hint within the white paper, that a broadening of the scope of the arts would be welcome, there are some memorable statements within the next set of Annual Reports,

most notably in the introduction of the 21st Annual Report (1965-66), where the Chairman is quoted as saying:

“If now battle is joined for the allegiance of young people between the attraction of the facile, slack and ultimately debasing forms of sub-artistic, under-civilised entertainment, and the contrary attraction of disciplined appreciation and hard, rewarding work, then we need to know and enlist all the allies we can get” (p.9)

This statement encapsulates the Arts Council approach to popular music, which is seen very much as debasing influence, and although within the text there is no visible discussion of more theoretical territory, this very much reflects the notion of popular culture as a threat to the aesthetic and improving nature of the arts. The focus on the audience more generally is relegated to a consideration of how to increase opportunities to see the products of professional art-form organisations with the assumption that if it is available, people will go, and is thus effectively embedded or inscribed into the question of geography: if there is a greater spread of activity, it will be more accessible to more people.

As it moves into the detail, *A Policy for the Arts* separates out the way in which government supports the arts into three headings, education, preservation and patronage. Education covering art in schools, further education, adult education and community centres, is seen as the responsibility of the Department of Education and Science. Preservation covers Museums and Galleries, looked after by the Treasury, and Historic Buildings and Public Monuments, the responsibility of the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works. Paragraph 19 of the White Paper then goes on to state:

“The patronage given by the State to music, drama, painting, sculpture and poetry is largely channelled through the Arts Council and their Scottish and Welsh Committees. The Council thus cover most of the fields not covered by other agencies.”

Here, the work done in the previous period to frame the Arts Council and the funding it receives as the route for state patronage of the arts has borne fruit, leading to validation in the White Paper, where its presence as the descriptor of the role of the Arts Council provides a significant and stabilising hinterland for the continuation of that role. As patron, the Arts Council is a distributor of funding to professional arts organisations, and to a much smaller extent, individual artists, who then have the artistic freedom to deliver as they see fit. Paragraph 27 of the White Paper states: “For the most part the Council give grants or guarantees to activities for which other sources contribute equal or greater support”, followed, in paragraph 28, by a list of funded organisations, which matches, and thus further stabilises, the list to be found in the Annual Accounts. Through that definition, alternative ways in which state funds could be used by the Arts Council are foregone, and the loss, for example, of the directly employed artists or the directly promoted concerts in factories documented in the previous Chapter, becomes an inevitable part of establishing and defining the ongoing role of the Arts Council. The funding element of the assemblage is stabilised, with an established purpose, and the only remaining question is the level of the funding to be made available to meet that purpose. Here also, the white paper concurs with the dominant narrative of the Annual Reports, in recognising the need for additional funding, which is one of the main actions arising from its publication.

What paragraphs 27 and 28 make explicit is that the model of working through a relatively small number of professional, art form specific, organisations, has become the naturalised methodology for Arts Council activity. The successful stabilisation of the art form and the art-form organisation (short-hand for not-for-profit art form specific professional arts organisation) is visible through the purely descriptive nature of the paragraphs. When combined with paragraph 19, which states that the Arts Council covers everything not otherwise encompassed under education or preservation, it demonstrates the extent to which not only the idea but also the practice that managing a relatively small number of operational relationships with arts organisations, has become stabilised and understood by the Arts Council as covering the entirety of the arts, and has then also been adopted by central government.

The question of standards and quality are similarly stabilised within the White Paper, with the orthodoxy of high quality provision visible throughout the document. There is mention of amateur in the context of the discussion on housing the arts, in particular the potential for amateur groups to make use of Arts Centres alongside professional companies, but no specific challenge to the role of the Arts Council in primarily supporting professional activity.

Within its text therefore, the white paper has firmly secured some elements of the assemblage: the art-form, the art-form organisation, the role of the Arts Council as the patron of those selected 'client' organisations, and the importance of quality; and provided a challenge to others, most notably geography. The actions set out in the White Paper reinforce this position, with a significant increase in the grant to the Arts Council predicated on the notion that this would

support both increased funding for the Regional Arts Associations, and funding for building projects. The increases in funding are visible in appendix four and, although it is clear from subsequent Annual Reports that funding was directed to the Regions and to building projects, it is also clear that the absolute majority was directed to art-form organisations, and that the large-scale metropolitan organisations took the absolute majority of that increase, even though their percentage increase was lower. The other action outlined in the paper was the renewal of the Royal Charter, which took place in 1967, with the main change being the removal of the word 'fine' (see appendix one for the relevant text). The removal of this one word, moving from the 'fine arts' to the 'arts', opened the door for the Arts Council to develop its approach to contemporary and experimental work, however, as with the regions, the relative level of funding used for this purpose is low, with the range of what was considered acceptable contemporary work largely confined to activity which was recognisably connected to the existing art-form specialisms.

In the next sections I work through the detail of the Annual Reports and Accounts from 1965 to 1985 to see how the process of stabilising the assemblage in the face of powerful calls for change was achieved. I draw on the Secretary General's reports, using both the text and the headings and sub-headings (see appendix four for a full list of the headings and sub-headings over the period), as both the structure and the content of the Secretary General's reports provide valuable insight.

7.3 The art-form, the art-form organisation and the patron

As described above, the 1965 white paper consolidated the existence of the art-

form as the primary Arts Council operational category, and also reaffirmed the primary role of the Arts Council as a patron to an identified set of independent client organisations. Before moving on to consider the challenges to stability over the next twenty years, it is important to recount how these two entities fared.

At the beginning of the period the art-form as the primary defining category was extremely well established, however its role in structuring the operational direction of the Arts Council did come under challenge. At the beginning of the period, the art-form department reports which had previously formed the backbone of the report, were relegated to the appendices, and there was experimentation with the discussion of policy areas and new developments, even if the detail still reveals a close adherence to the stabilised importance of the art form and the professional art-form specialist organisations. By 1984-85 however, the art-forms were back as the main organising principle for the report, indicating that they had successfully re-established their primacy. What is visible in the interim is the process by which that re-establishment takes place, and the importance of the operating structure in that process. The operating structure of the Arts Council remained largely stable throughout this whole period, with on the executive side art-form directors and their departments working under the Secretary-General, and on the governance side art-form advisory panels reporting up to the Council. Although not separately documented, these structures are visible within the Arts Council Annual Reports and Accounts, with the senior staff and the make-up of the advisory panels published within the text of the reports. They are also visible in the headings and sub-headings of both the narrative report and the accounts, which provide a visible trail of the

interaction between the two structures and their relative success or otherwise in stabilising particular elements of the funding assemblage. The way in which these structures had already stabilised the art-form as a structuring principle, removing the space to provide a suitable hinterland for policy initiatives sitting outside the realm of specific art-forms was discussed in the previous Chapter, and this particular effect of the operating structure continues right through this period (even with, in 1979, the first structured review of Arts Council internal working practices, which reduces the overall number of advisory committees).

The internal structure does slowly evolve both as a result of the white paper and the change in the charter, however it does so in a manner that continues to foreground the role of the art-form, and tracking that evolution provides a route to see how successfully or otherwise the existing assemblage was able to navigate change, through the framing of any debate entirely within a pre-existing set of conditions of possibility.

Until the end of the 1960s the Arts Council Annual Reports and Accounts give very little inkling of the huge societal and cultural change taking place in the UK, other than the occasional statement, such as that given by the Chairman in 1965 (see quote above) decrying the pernicious influence of popular culture on young people. The only structural change was the introduction of the Young People's Theatre Panel. However, by the mid 1970s there had been, relatively speaking, a seismic shift, with the setting up of a plethora of sub-committees to the main art-form panels, including a short-lived experimental projects sub-committee, and separate sub-committees for performance art, fringe and experimental theatre, new drama, jazz, opera, and ballet; and new committees for Regional

(with its own sub-committee for arts centres); Community Arts, Art Film (with a sub-committee for Artists' Films), and Touring. At the same time however, the staffing structure had only expanded to include a Regional department, alongside the continuing Music, Art, Drama and Literature departments, so the panels, other than those sitting under 'Regional' were still being serviced by art-form specific staff, and the limits of what was considered kept within those areas of expertise. The success or otherwise of the sub-committees in stabilising their position is visible not only in the staffing structure, but also in the financial accounts, where headings come and go as particular areas of activity failed to establish themselves as a core part of the work of the Arts Council.

Although the patron client relationship also appears to be fully stabilised by 1965, the decision of the Arts Council to adopt the role of patron to a set of independent art-form organisations structured in the main as charities, continues to be explicitly discussed on a number of occasions. Each time the discussion focuses on the benefits, which fall into three broad camps: firstly, the art-form organisations' knowledge of their art-form; secondly, and certainly for the non-national organisations, their capacity to be locally responsive, thus ensuring that the Arts Council was not imposing a top-down arts policy on the nation (the arm's length approach doubled up); and finally the structure of voluntary trustees which was almost universal within their client organisations, mirroring to some extent the role of the Arts Council's own Council and Advisory Panels, and bringing what was seen as a depth of freely given advice and expertise to the development of the arts.

There is no discussion of any possible limitations of the approach, and, as can

be seen below in the discussion on 'community arts' and 'ethnic minority arts', the arms-length methodology was adapted and adopted into other contexts, on the same basis that it provided the opportunity to support organisations with the right skills.

7.4 The challenge to stability

A Policy for the Arts provided two of the major challenges to the stability of the funding assemblage as it was organised in 1965: the focus on the regions, and the need to reach wider audiences. The 1960s and 1970s also provided significant external pressures, with the huge expansion in popular culture, and the increasing focus on equalities, visible through legislation (i.e. the 1976 Race Relations Act), and a turbulent economic climate. Nevertheless, twenty years later in 1984-85, the Annual Report and Accounts are once again structured by art-form, and the *Glory of the Garden* once again highlights the significant discrepancy in funding and activity between London and the rest of the country. The funding assemblage established through the 1950s was still in place.

As outlined above, the key challenges came both from *A Policy for the Arts*, and from wider societal change, and I start by considering the evidence in the reports in relation to the process of managing the need to address funding for the regions. I demonstrate how multiple stabilising mechanisms developed which enabled the regional question to be absorbed within the existing assemblage. These include: the shaping of the Regional Arts Associations; the development of Touring as a distinct strand of the Arts Council programme, and its relationship with the capital programme, *Housing the Arts*; and finally, the presentational use

of the Annual Reports and Accounts themselves.

Regional Arts Associations had been appearing in the accounts right back to 1957, simply as another category of client organisation allocated to the account heading *Arts Centres and Arts Clubs*. The consideration of the Regional Arts Associations as a substantially different kind of entity starts in the 1965-66 Annual Report, with a section entitled *The Arts in the Regions*. This revisits the decision in the mid 1950s to close the regional offices of the Arts Council, linking it to the differing roles of the Arts Council and CEMA, under whose auspices the regional offices were established, and highlighting the primary function of the Arts Council as a “grants commission for the arts” (p.22).

As discussed in the previous section, the role of the Arts Council as a grant giver rather than a direct deliverer was not an inevitable outcome when the Arts Council was first established, however by 1964 it has become the orthodox position. The Annual Report set out the different models of Arts Association that have organically developed since the closure of the regional offices (triggered in the first instance by strong protests in the South West region when the 1955 closures took place, which led to the Arts Council providing financial support for the administration of a South West Arts Association to replace the lost regional functions). The SWAA, like many of the other Arts Associations, brought together “arts centres, societies and clubs” (p.22) and did not address what the secretary general described as the major artistic activities in a region “e.g. concerts by symphony and other orchestras; the work of resident repertory and other dramatic companies; opera and ballet companies; arts exhibitions; arts festivals; and literary activities”, a list remarkably similar to the established and stabilised

version of the arts recognised as being in need of public funding via the Arts Council. It drew on the example of the North East Arts Association, which addressed not only the content that the Arts Council would like to see, but also the role of local government as funding partner, by bringing local authorities into a subscriber model, to provide a model that could properly address the goal of *A Policy for the Arts*. The space for alternative conceptions for the shape and the role of regional structures was being closed down. The following paragraph is worth quoting in full, as it provides a clear map for the proposed management of Regional Arts Associations, in a mould that would work with the existing grain of the Arts Council:

“The right solution for England would appear to be nine or ten regional associations properly equipped with first rate staffs, rather than the proliferation of associations at (say) the county level, which could easily result in an excessive multiplication of administrative machinery without sufficient funds left over for the job in hand. There is no doubt that if the newly established regional associations prove themselves to be as effective as the NEAA, the Arts Council would recognise them as proper instruments for distributing part of its subsidies for the arts; and such a set up could provide an excellent way of re-establishing the regional well-being of the arts in this country” (p.24, 1965-66 Annual Report and Accounts).

As can be seen from the detail of the accounts (appendix four), this solution was enacted, and the early experimentation with a wide range of local models working at different geographic levels and with a variety of interests,

demonstrated by the list of funded organisations and activities, was curtailed, so that by 1984-85 there were twelve relatively standard and coherent regional arts associations, rather than the far more singular list of organisations operating over a range of scales and purposes present in 1965.

Over the same period, the operating structure adapted to absorb the regions, with in 1968, the establishment of a new senior post called the 'Chief Regional Advisor, with a remit to:

“1 to advise the Council on the activities, plans and requirements of regional, district and local Arts Associations, and generally on matters of interest to the Council arising from local initiatives, whether municipal or private;

2 to advise Arts Associations, Local Authorities (including Local Education Authorities) and other interested parties on the promotion and support of artistic activities in the regions;

3 to make recommendations to the Council on these matters, and on questions of policy relating thereto” (p.19, 23rd Annual Report and Accounts 1968).”

The report goes on to make the point that this includes London as a region, and is not “exclusively concerned with what used to be called ‘the provinces’” (p.19). The driver behind the post is stated as coming from the work that the regional arts associations were doing independently, having established their own standing conference. At this point, there was no separate budget line for regional staff, however the post is listed from 1969 alongside the art-form directors.

The 1971 Annual Report, which reflects on the first twenty-five years of the Arts Council, describes the Regional Arts Association as a recent phenomenon, going back five years and relating the establishment of ten Regional Arts Associations in that period, separating them out entirely from and losing their connection to the regional offices of CEMA and the plethora of small, locally initiated Arts Associations that developed after 1955. This process of expunging the complexities of the recent past is a recurrent one in the Annual Reports, and reflects the position held by Belfiore and Bennett in relation to cultural amnesia discussed in Chapter One.

The 1971 report describes the Regional Arts Association as “a systematic partnership between the Arts Council of Great Britain and a large group of local authorities, designed to develop and maintain artistic activity and appreciation throughout a whole region” (p.25, 1970-1). It also highlights the financial relationship, with local authorities subscribing an annual sum to be a part of the Association, a point picked up across the next few reports, with particularly important points made in the 76-77 report and again in 77-78, in relation to the desire of the Arts Council for local authorities to direct arts expenditure through their RAA: the 1977-78 report states:

“The Arts Council’s programme of Regional Development will not be complete, even its first phase, until each local authority has recognised its responsibility to its Regional Arts Association and has acknowledged the need for supporting the arts, both directly and through the Association, within its own boundaries.” (1977-78, p.12)

This work continues with the Arts Council using the Annual Reports as a

vehicle to set out how it sees the relationship between itself, the Regional Arts Associations, and Local Authorities, with the 78-79 report articulating its position on questions of quality, standards and the confidence of the arts sector in the work of the RAAs. From 1977-78 onwards the Arts Council Annual Reports include an additional table setting out more detail on the expenditure of each of the RAAs, using the sub-headings: Basic subsidy, Music and Dance, Touring, Drama, Arts, Literature, Arts centre, Community Arts, Supplementary subsidies.

At the same time, the internal operational location for regional activity has been on the move: the Chief Regional Advisor remained in place until 1972-3 when it became a Director level post, accompanied by a Department for Regional Development, with responsibilities for research, statistics and marketing, and a separate Advisory Committee; from 1975-75 the accounts show 'regional' as a separate department under staffing costs (a notable addition to the departmental list of Music, Drama, Art, Literature, Finance and Administration). Only a year later however, the Director level post and the separate Regional Department are lost, and regional work integrated into Central administration under the direction of the Deputy Secretary-General, retaining the separate Advisory Committee, which the art-form directors were expected to attend. A regional department then re-appears in 1979-80, following the review of the working practices of the Arts Council, this time it has a wider set of responsibilities, including the Regional Arts Associations, Touring, community arts, arts centres and mixed-media festivals; in other words, a home for a variety of activities that did not easily fit within the art-form focused departmental structure. By 1982-83 this expanded to include 'Housing the Arts' (see below). The impact of this widened and embedded

responsibility is seen in the departmental reports for 1983-84 and 1984-85, in which the regional department text moves away from a discussion as to how the Arts Council should be engaging regionally into a much more descriptive narrative of activity, with the focus given to the other areas of responsibility, in particular touring, which is more easily managed within the established art-form/art form organisation model. The regional question is starting to be stabilised and absorbed into the operating structure of the Arts Council.

The second route which develops to address the regional question was touring, and in particular touring the work of the existing Arts Council clients. The early 1970s saw the Arts Council take on the work of DALTA (the previously independent Dramatic and Lyric Theatre Association) to organise the touring of opera, ballet and drama. This started as a small operation with a remit to tour work by companies of national and international standing. In 1974-75 a separate Touring Committee was established, and the name changed to Arts Council Touring, with a Director of Touring post created in 1975-76, sitting alongside the Art Form Directors. As mentioned above, in 1979-80, touring was integrated into the new Regional department, and other than the grants given directly to the RAAs, had the largest budget of that department: by 1984-85 the Annual Accounts show that touring had an expenditure of £3.84m, divided across sub-headings of opera, dance, drama and the Visiting Arts Unit. The development of the Touring department is clearly supporting activity into the regions, but strictly within the conditions set by the pre-existing assemblage: expenditure is organised by art-form and used to take the work of mainly metropolitan professional art-form specialist Arts Council client organisations out into the

regions.

Housing the Arts was another area that by 1984-85 had been integrated into the role of the Regional Department. This was the capital fund established as a result of *A Policy for the Arts* to address the identified need for more and better buildings in which to present art. It undoubtedly had an impact on the development of buildings for the arts across the UK (it was a UK policy cutting across the boundaries which meant that revenue activity was largely autonomous in Scotland and Wales). However, as can be seen from the list of facilities supported, it focused very much on creating the physical spaces necessary for housing the Arts Council client organisations, and for receiving the work of the Arts Council client organisations on tour.

The development of the Regional Department was one way of managing the regional funding question, another route taken in the Annual Reports and Accounts was to revise how the spending was described. This was the main thrust of the 1969-70 Secretary General's report, which sets out the basis on which the funding is given to national organisations, which serve the country as whole, and to others (called supported organisations), which did not have a national role. By separating out and allocating to the nation as a whole, the significant expenditure on the four national entities (three of which were London based: The Royal Opera House, Sadler's Wells, and the National Theatre Board, with the Royal Shakespeare Company as the fourth) could be presented as a distinct item. This is demonstrated visually in the 1976-77 Annual Report which has a bar chart diagram (p.13) showing the percentage of overall expenditure at five yearly intervals from 1956-57 onwards, with categories (left to right):

Scotland, Wales, National Companies, Opera and dance, Music, Drama, Arts, Arts Associations, Centres, Festivals and Literature, Housing the Arts, Touring, Administration. As ever with the presentation of data, there are a whole range of points that could be picked up here, from the choice of starting point (going back a further ten years would have given a very different picture), and the use of percentages rather than absolute figures during a period when the absolute level of expenditure had increased significantly (with a smaller percentage still representing a significant absolute increase in expenditure), to the application of categories in a period before they were in use within the Arts Council. However, the overall effect is to reduce hugely the proportion of the bar allocated to Opera and Dance and to Drama.

The question of engagement, access and audiences is the second of the main challenges raised by *A Policy for the Arts*. The assemblage that had developed from 1946 onwards had a very clear focus on the art-form and the professional art-form organisation, with the Arts Council placing itself into the role of patron to those organisations. Access, although core to the Royal Charter, had demonstrably taken a back seat, and questions about engagement, access and audiences were not visible, other than as an adjunct to support for client organisations.

The notion of the audience had until this point been relatively invisible, and despite the desire of *A Policy for the Arts* to see an increased focus on widening access, still does not really surface as a topic that requires discussion until the 1971-72 Annual Report, when it appears as one of four themes: “(a) the need to reach more audiences, (b) administration and publicity, (c) touring (particularly

touring of opera) and (d) Regional Arts Associations” (p.13). The report goes on to state that: “The four themes are really linked in a single emphasis on the second of the Council’s function under its Charter - to increase the availability of the arts; a stretching out by the Council’s clients and by the Council itself to reach more people” (p.13). This statement highlights the importance of the client organisations (as well as reinforcing the developing role for touring picked up earlier), but it is in the detail of the text relating to audiences that the beginnings of a particular way of approaching the audience question emerges and comes to the fore. Having asked itself how many people are affected and whether the number is growing, the focus is on supply, how many organisations are directly or indirectly subsidised by the Arts Council, and how much directly promoted work was taking place, with a summary statement that “All this reaches, and involves, many people in many places” (p.14). It is worth noting an approach to audience quantification that would today be considered naive, in that the numbers of tickets sold is translated directly into numbers of people engaged, with no consideration as to the potential for repeat attenders. In terms of that quantification, it then goes on to suggest that the continuing existence of the organisations was a marker of audience interest, as it demonstrated their capacity to generate ticket revenue. A short discussion of the importance of subsidy for supporting work that is not “immediately popular” then leads into the following statement: “Despite all this, the Council believe that there are seats empty which, with better promotion methods, could be filled, and that the audience contribution to the total cost requires consideration.” (p.14). This is a significant moment, as this statement provides clarity on the way in which the process of audience development unfolds over the next decade and a half, with

the focus very much on audience as income generation, providing the funds to enable the professional, client organisations to operate. Despite the importance given in the text to the goal of increasing the availability of the arts, questions of access have been demoted to a supporting role, and continue to be invisible within the operating structure (see appendix four - departmental structure): unlike the developments in relation to both the regional question and touring, no distinct advisory committee was established, and no high level post was put in place, undermining any potential to develop a distinct hinterland where it might have been possible to develop a more nuanced understanding in relation to engagement in the arts.

Nevertheless, the question of audiences does just about continue to be visible within the text of the Annual Reports, even though it does not warrant a continuing sub-section of its own. Exploring the detail of those texts shows the development of the particular focus on audiences and income. In 1972-73 the development of marketing activity appears with: a central marketing and research team set up as part of the (relatively short-lived) regional department; schemes to test marketing strategies in Birmingham, Bristol and Sheffield developed in partnership with the Regional Arts Associations; and the report of a Commission into Seat Pricing. (p.14). By 1975-76, the Research and Information and Marketing teams warrant a paragraph each: documenting that the research team carried out an analysis of local authority spending on the arts, published a report on the impact of inflation on subsidised theatres and orchestras, and for the first time published detailed attendance figures for theatres.

There are two further points where an explicit discussion of the responsibility for wider access appears in the General-Secretary's Report (as opposed to the more descriptive departmental reports, where it is to be found almost wholly in the Marketing section). These occur in the 1978-79 Annual Report (p.7 onwards), and again in 1982-83 Report, where it is the sole focus. Both reports are strongly defensive of the work of the Arts Council and need to be read in the light of a changed political context, with the first written shortly after the election of the 1979 Conservative government. The 1979 Report presents an argument for the Council as a whole and addresses their responsibilities under the Charter both for quality and for access. There is a defence of the need to make judgements around quality, and this is neatly segued into the need to provide "access to excellence". The role of existing Arts Council programmes of touring, regional Centres of Excellence, and reduced ticket prices are identified as increasing access, drawing on the work already outlined above in touring, housing the arts, and marketing. Education is identified as a second major route for increasing access "...access to the arts is largely limited by social factors and by access to education in the arts" (p.8), and during the year in question the Arts Council appointed its first officer with responsibility for education (an Education Liaison Officer) on a two year temporary basis. An understanding of what the Arts Council felt should be achieved through this approach to education is best developed through a consideration of the Arts Council position in relation to community arts.

Community arts first appear directly in the Chairman's introduction to the 1972-73 Annual Report, with a short paragraph (p.12) outlining the Council's

need for more information both to understand the potential of community arts to engage people, in particular young people, in the arts, and to understand the relationship between community arts and the work that was being considered by the recently established Experimental Projects Committee. The Arts Council commissioned a working party, led by Professor Harold Baldry to investigate community arts, with their report published in June 1974. Both the report and the narrative within the Annual Reports describe community arts as a new phenomenon, drawing up a short history back to the early sixties, and linking it specifically to the development of experimental theatre and performance, first coming to the attention of the Arts Council through funding applications. As these did not fit within then understanding of the Art-form panels, a 'New Activities Committee' had been formed both to provide a home for the applications and to report back on how they should be managed. This report, delivered in 1970, led to the establishment of the Experimental Projects Committee, which met until the end of 1973. Kelly (1984) argues that this was only one of a number of strands which came together in the nascent community arts movement, including activities with a much longer history such as West Indian Carnival. Within the Arts Council however, the following statement could be made:

“By then the projects considered by that committee seemed mainly to come under two categories which could be described as *Performance Art* and *Community Arts*...Most of the other activities had been absorbed, not always happily, by Experimental Drama, Arts Centres, Art Panel, DALTA, Small Scale Touring, the Contemporary Music Network, The Literature Panel's Small Print Fund, and the Regional Arts

Associations...*Performance Art* has been taken under the wing of the Art Panel..." (p.37-38, *Community arts: The Report of the Community Arts Working Party*, June 1974, (also known as the Baldry Report)).

Through the separating out of a distinct community arts field, all the other experimental activity was able to be placed within the bounds of the existing art-form categories. Law's discussion of fractionality is helpful here: fractional realities were used to help maintain the assemblage. Similarly, the report does not give a precise definition of *Community Arts*, offering instead a thoughtful discussion of artists working with people, but failing to describe any concrete examples of community arts in practice. Having made the case through reference to the Charter that community arts were properly the concern of the Arts Council, the Baldry Report (p.12) considers how to manage community arts within the Arts Council framework and makes the case for establishing a new community arts category to sit alongside the existing art-form categories. It argues that a fund of £250,000 should be established for funding community arts activity in England. Kelly (1984) argues that the failure to define community arts in the report was due to a well-meaning desire to ensure that community arts could be funded, and that discussion of the detail was considered detrimental to that outcome. Given the practical examples of community arts that Kelly then gives, including groups working in West Indian Carnival, traditional English folk dance, African dance and drumming, and given the position of the Arts Council, as discussed earlier, in relation to amateur and community activity, this appears to have been a valid perception. However, it again allows the slipperiness inherent in the different fractional realities to be used in support of maintaining

the assemblage. Kelly makes the point that by not addressing what he describes as the core challenge of community arts to the arts establishment (that in its delivery it espoused collective rather than individual creativity, thus undermining the core premise of the importance and difference embodied in the individual artist) the way was opened up for the absorption of a modified form of community arts into that establishment and I suggest that this modified form is an example of fractionality in action. This is a topic which I explored within my (unpublished) Masters thesis, which considered the way in which the West Indian Carnival tradition was brought into contact with the Arts Council through very small levels of funding, and then transformed first into Carnival Arts and then Outdoor Arts, and through those transitions, lost the subversive and the political dimensions which had previously been sited at the core of the tradition. Kelly argues that the nascent collective voice for community arts, ACA (the Association of Community Arts), entered into dialogue with the Arts Council primarily in search of funding, and it was the acceptance of relatively (and absolutely) small amounts of funding that enabled that marginalisation to take place. One of the actions of the Arts Council was to fund ACA and its successor organisation, the Shelton Trust, to provide support services for community artists. This placed the support function for community arts (a function which was provided directly by Arts Council employees to art-form specialist clients) outside the Arts Council into what then effectively became a client organisation itself. The potential for the Arts Council to develop any internal expertise or knowledge was lost, and at the same time, this also meant that the external client organisation did not have an expert officer within the Arts Council in the same way as the traditional art-form clients did.

The process by which community arts was brought into the funding process and then marginalised is visible in the narratives and accounts of the next ten years' Annual Reports, particularly in the statements of the Chairman and the Secretary-General, which questioned the logic of funding activity that 'bites the hand that feeds it', and argued that the reason for funding community arts is to provide a route to bring people into contact with 'the arts', thus enabling them to move towards an appreciation of the core artistic tradition which represented the majority of the Arts Council activity, rather than to provide any challenge to that tradition. Thus, the potential challenge presented by community arts had effectively been neutralised and transformed into a part of the work of educating people to recognise the importance of the Arts Council funded art forms, and with a much smaller and more vulnerable budget than envisaged by the Baldry Report. Community arts finally disappears from the main Arts Council accounts in 1980-81, replaced by combined arts.

In 1976 the Arts Council published a report called *The Arts Britain Ignores: the arts of ethnic minorities in Britain*, authored by Naseem Khan, and co-commissioned with the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation and the Community Relations Commission. Khan's report made it very clear that the arts of ethnic minorities were being ignored and were not recognised effectively by the Arts Council, Regional Arts Associations, or Community Relations Officers. Khan argued that: "in very broad terms, the aim of arts patronage is to allow people to develop their own voices and modes of expression. The fact that a certain percentage of new Britons do so through different forms from the standard native-British ones should make little difference, nor does it necessarily mean

that those forms are exclusive to ethnic minorities” (p.127). Khan was attempting to challenge on multiple levels, ranging from the embedded nature of community arts activity, through to the lack of awareness of highly skilled professional arts traditions, and again, the breadth of the ground covered left open the space to bring these within the framing of the existing arts funding assemblage: the fractionality inherent in the definitions allowed some realities to be absorbed as others were rejected. As with community arts, ‘ethnic arts’ and ‘minority arts’ do appear sporadically in the narrative of the Annual Reports, but don’t even manage to generate a sub-heading in the accounts. The immediate impact of Khan’s report was an Arts Council contribution of £5000 towards establishing a Minority Arts Advisory Service (MAAS). This followed the model used for Community Arts, effectively placing responsibility for ‘minority arts’ outside the Arts Council itself and losing the potential to develop in-house knowledge (it is a further ten years before the Arts Council creates their first *Action Plan on the Ethnic Minority Arts*). Within the detail of the accounts small amounts of funding do start to go to organisations working broadly in the field of what was then described as minority or ethnic arts, however as with the funding for community arts, this support is limited, vulnerable to pressure, and highly partial.

The very high rates of inflation throughout the 1970s and into the early 1980s, and the turbulence of the overall economy is very visible in the Annual Reports, despite the fact that the absolute amount of funding available to the Arts Council had increased substantially following *A Policy for the Arts* and continued to increase ahead of inflation pretty much constantly until 1979. The impact of inflation on the existing client organisations is a constant presence throughout

the seventies, and is reflected in the titles of the reports, which reappear in 1976 with *The Arts in Hard Times*, followed in 1977 with *Value for Money*. Pressure on the budget is cited as the reason for not funding community arts to the extent set out in the Baldry Report, as demonstrated in the chairman's introduction to the 1974-75 report:

“The Council would like to devote greater resources to the more recent developments such as community arts, experimental theatre, photography and jazz, but given that so many of our great companies, orchestras and other enterprises are in present conditions underfunded, the Council is inevitably hesitant about taking on even wider responsibilities and responding to new initiatives as it would wish” (p.13).

However, this economic argument struggles in the face of the evidence, with the total grant-in-aid at least keeping pace with inflation, and in particular when considering the rapid increase of funding for the Touring programme.

7.5 Conclusion

The funding assemblage comes through the twenty years to 1984 remarkably intact. The structures which developed in the first twenty years of the Arts Council, the art-form panels and departments, the specialist art-form client organisations, and the Arts Council itself as art-form patron, continue more or less unchanged, with major challenges either marginalised, as is the case for Community Arts, or absorbed, for example the linkage of touring to the question of regional funding, and the subsequent structuring of the touring budget to reflect the existing art-form structure and client base. The triple lock identified at the end of Chapter Five successfully absorbed specific challenges, including the

emergence of community arts, and the recognition of ethnic minority arts. A detailed analysis of the process by which those challenges were absorbed shows how the fractionality inherent in definitions of arts and culture enabled the successful integration of realities that could work within the arts funding assemblage whilst at the same time pushing to one side the realities which did not.

8. Through the Turn to Business

8.1 Introduction

This Chapter follows on chronologically, picking up with the 1984 publication of *The Glory of the Garden*, the first ten year strategy for the Arts Council, as my starting point, and following the assemblage up to the 1997 General Election. It is five years in to a new political landscape, and the implications of that change are starting to work through into the public language and actions of the Arts Council, and the assemblage is facing new challenges. I continue to use the Annual Reports and Accounts of the Arts Council as my main source material, again drawing on additional documents including *The Glory of the Garden* itself, other internal the Arts Council reports, and towards the end of the period, material relating to the development of data collection activity.

8.2 The Glory of The Garden

The Glory of the Garden was the first national strategy produced by the Arts Council, and subtitled *The Development of the Arts in England, A Strategy for a Decade*. Developed following a review with key stakeholders it presented the Arts Council response to the very changed political landscape of the early 1980s, including in 1982 the first time that the Arts Council had faced a real terms reduction in its financial settlement, its decision to manage this reduction through a withdrawal of support from some client organisations (it is notable here that the text refers to the very small average size of the organisations from which funding

was withdrawn: effectively, client organisations which had not established a need for larger sums became more vulnerable to the withdrawal of funding). The other major political change looming on the horizon was the abolition of the Greater London Council and the other Metropolitan County Councils, all of whom were significant co-funders of the Arts Council clients. The strategy also identifies what it describes as major changes in the nature of society and their implications for arts funding (p.2), including changes in what it describes as “enforced leisure, the economic depression effecting older city centres, and perceptions of the requirements of a multi-cultural society”.

The Glory of the Garden is admirably clear about the need for change in the workings of the Arts Council, recognising that it had created a structure that might not be the best fit for its current purpose, and that had been “wedded by long practice even to the categories of grant available to its clients” (p.1), a nod at the impact of organisational structure on what could and could not be funded. The Annual Report and Accounts for 1983-4 give an equally clear statement about the purpose of the review, highlighting two principles, the first to address the funding gap between the regions and London, which twenty years on from *A Policy for the Arts* still had not been resolved, and the second to work in partnership, both with local authorities and private sponsors (p.4). The description of the process used to develop the strategy tells a slightly different story. Other than Local Authorities, all the other named participants were either organisations that had either come into being as a result of the existence of the Arts Council, or were in receipt of funding from the Arts Council: “the Council decided that the review should be conducted in the fullest possible collaboration

with its clients, its advisory panels and committees, the Regional Arts Associations and local authorities" (p.3). On the one hand, these were the organisations most likely to be affected by the new strategy and therefore taking their views into account would be seen as a sensible part of the decision-making process. On the other, their intimate enmeshing within the hinterland of the existing arts funding assemblage meant that the *The Glory of the Garden* could only develop within rather than beyond that assemblage. By working with the set of organisations listed in the text the conditions of possibility were already established, and the potential to imagine otherwise was very limited. The long throw of the decisions of CEMA to structure its sub-committees using specific, named art-forms rather than any other descriptor, and of the Arts Council to focus on its role as the patron of the arts, were still very much still present.

A good starting point for understanding the direction set by *The Glory of the Garden* is the preface, where the then chairman, Sir William Rees Mogg states:

"On the whole I prefer to argue for funding the Arts Council on the contribution of the arts to British civilization. But it is obvious that the attraction of London as an artistic metropolis is essential to Great Britain's appeal to tourists. The loss of London's arts would cost the balance of trade as much as the loss of a major industry. The economic argument is quite clear cut and it applies most strongly to London, though it also applies to the regional arts".

Here, the argument for the arts is clearly an economic one, despite a fond nod back to the civilizing role of the arts. The direction signalled in the preface carries through into the body of the document, where the influence of the dominant

political dogma can be seen, with the language and processes of business very much coming into play. The text sets out its four stated principles for development: the first addressing the imbalance in perceived quality and quantity of regional versus London based arts provision; the second identifying the specific regional areas for development, based on population density; the third tackling perceived imbalances in funding between art forms; and the fourth bringing in the concept of challenge funding, where the availability of local funding will have an effect on Council funding decisions. These principles are the basis for the whole strategy, and they clearly demonstrate what was seen to matter. Importantly 'the arts' defined as the arts funding assemblage already contains within it questions of funding and finance, which enables the assemblage to manage and incorporate the new political direction, with the art-forms, their professional providers and the Arts Council as patron continuing as core to the arts funding assemblage.

The Glory of the Garden lists the criteria by which its revenue clients (the organisations which received regular funding from the Arts Council, at this point on an effectively permanent basis) were assessed: these fourteen criteria (see appendix five for the full text) provide a clear insight into the way in which the Arts Council saw its client organisations. The first two address artistic quality and strength. Six relate to financial and operational stability (box office returns, security of tenure etc.), with one more asking the extent to which stated aims and objectives are reached. One covers the existence of an education policy, one employment and other opportunities for members of ethnic minority groups; one the balance of provision between London and the regions. Again, participants

are only visible through traces, the mention of 'other opportunities' for members of ethnic minority groups, and 'the provision of arts to the community'. The development plan set out in part five of the strategy specified the five areas of work it intended to prioritise for the next five years. These were Art, Dance, Drama, Music and Education; in terms of allocated budgets the art-forms had a combined £2.65m, education £150,000. In purely financial terms, the assemblage was holding firm.

There is no detail comparable to the assessment criteria for arts organisations set out for assessing or understanding audiences or participants. People taking part in the arts are only present through traces in relation to the core themes of the strategy, decentralisation and income generation, in for example the focus on those areas of greatest population density to address imbalance of provision. Again, this relative invisibility demonstrates the capacity of the assemblage to resist change: despite the continued presence within the Royal Charter of the requirement to increase accessibility, the way that this was enacted was entirely through a focus on client organisations, rather than any direct engagement, for example with people who were not taking part, other than where legislatively required, such as the mention of 'ethnic minority' groups.

Decentralisation was the key message of the strategy, with a recognition that in order to affect a real difference the change required was not only financial, but also administrative and institutional (Chairman's introduction, p.v). One of the multiple prompts for the strategy was the publication of the Policy Studies Institute working paper, *A Hard Fact to Swallow*, which stated that the Arts Council expenditure per head of population in London was three and a half times

more than the next best provided region (Merseyside Arts) and nine times more than the least well provided (Eastern Arts). *The Glory of the Garden* set out the Arts Council approach to changing the financial and institutional situation, identifying eleven major centres of population, plus Norwich/Ipswich and Plymouth (to cover the Eastern Seaboard and the South West respectively), which it argued covered 40 million out of the total 47 million population, allowing for a 30 mile (50 for London) radius. The basis for using the 30/50 mile radius is not made explicit. These centres were to be the focus of investment, through a challenge funding mechanism, with localities expected to match the funding. The focus of the planned expenditure was to ensure that these strategic centres all had well supported regional assets, including a building-based repertory company, a regional orchestra, arts galleries and museums, and major receiving houses for Arts Council touring productions. These requirements mirrored the approach that had already been taken in London, and very much focused on the form of provision I argued in the previous Chapter as having developed as result of the co-evolution of the Arts Council and its client organisations. The major administrative change is the devolution of client organisations from the Arts Council to the RAAs, again, rather than opening up space for different approaches to develop, the route taken further tied the RAAs into the dominant mode of operation as established by the Arts Council, requiring the RAAs to act as a patron of a defined set of regularly funded client organisations.

The Glory of the Garden, as with *A Policy for the Arts*, continued to reinforce and stabilise the existing arts funding assemblage, this time driven internally to meet the challenge of a very changed political agenda. The re-statement of the

focus on the professional art form specialist organisation, and the pulling through of that focus into not only the challenge funding, but also the devolution to the RAAs, further embedded the core structural roles of those two entities, the art form and the art-form specialist organisation. By this point, nearly forty years after the establishment of the Arts Council, they have become wholly axiomatic. It is worth noting that, although *The Glory of the Garden* was described as a ten-year strategy, its visibility in the Annual Reports and Accounts does not last, and by 1994 it is not mentioned at all. The re-balancing of funds between London and regions also failed to materialise: although it successfully enabled the continued operation of an arts funding assemblage, it did not achieve its own stated goals.

8.3 Managing Change

The Annual Reports and Accounts from 1985 through to 1996 provide a useful window into the impact of the changed political landscape. Again, the detail of the account headings, narrative structure and advisory panels are captured in appendix four. In the following section I explore the continuing stability of the two entities, the art-form and the art-form client organisation, the development of a 'new' art-form category 'combined arts', and the impact of the political context in particular in relation to funding and the role of audiences. I start by looking in detail at the 1995-96 Annual Report and Accounts (the last written before the 1997 General Election) and comparing back to the position in 1984 to show how the two entities, the art-form and the art-form client organisation have fared over the intervening twenty-one years.

The art-form as category came through the years to 1995-96 in robust health. It continued to frame the structure of the narrative of the report and had absorbed

into itself new categories including: 'Education and training', 'International Initiatives Fund', 'Cross Disciplinary initiatives', and 'Touring' which were all included under the heading "Grants by Art Form" (p.61). This feature indicates that the term art-form, within the Arts Council itself, had taken on a very different meaning to that which it might carry in the wider world, able to flex itself to accommodate activity that would not otherwise be considered as an art-form, whilst retaining as its core a set of established art-forms, which remain stable as the additional categories come and go. These established art-forms also continued to dominate in terms of expenditure. Of the £123,143,000 spent in 1995-96 on grants, £101,018,000 went towards the long-standing art-form categories (dance, drama and mime, literature, music, and visual arts), with a further £4,707,000 to Touring (as previously discussed then sub-divided by art-form). Further interrogation of the organisations funded under those headings demonstrates a now familiar focus on the established, 'traditional' art-form definitions. Taking music as an example, even though it had now expanded to include a greater range of activity, the majority of expenditure continued to be directed towards opera and orchestral music. Of the total spend under the Music heading (£43.7m), the two opera houses, Royal Opera House, and English National Opera, both categorised as national organisations, received £20.7m, and the rest of the regularly funded organisations received £21m. Within the £21m there were a few new entrants into the regularly funded organisation category, reflecting in particular the impact of policy in relation to ethnic minority arts, including for example the African & Caribbean and Asian Music Circuits, however all the awards of £1m or more went to long established clients delivering orchestral music or opera. Newer activities were predominantly funded through

the project route, with applications dependent on the availability of an appropriate activity fund and having to be made for each activity. The level of funding for each organisation available through this route was significantly lower: twenty-eight organisations shared the £21m spent on regularly funded organisations; forty organisations shared the £142,000 spent on African, Caribbean and Asian Music. After the grants made through the established art-form and touring categories were accounted for, there was some £18m remaining expenditure on grant funding in 1995-96, of which £16,576,000 went to Combined Arts, a category that had only just emerged at the beginning of this period, and one which warrants further exploration to understand how it developed and became a stable entity, and the role it thus plays in this narrative.

By 1995-96 Combined Arts had become established as an art-form category and a department with its own section in the report. Combined Arts first appeared in the 1981-82 Annual Report and Accounts relating to England as a sub-committee of the Regional Advisory Committee, taking the place of the Community Arts sub-committee which made its last appearance in 1980-81. In the first few years of its existence there were only occasional references in the narrative texts (for example, in 1984-84, "Ethnic minority arts, always a concern of Combined Arts..." (p.13)), and it first appeared in the accounts in 1986-87 as a sub-heading under Arts Centres and Community Projects. In 1987-88 the Annual Report stated that the Combined Arts Unit had ceased to exist, because moving responsibility for arts centres and community arts to the Regional Arts Associations following *The Glory of Garden* meant that "...it has become less necessary for the Council itself to maintain separate resources" (p.8). The

remaining central responsibilities for performance art reverted back to the Visual Arts department, and the two remaining client organisations, Notting Hill Carnival and the ICA reported directly to the Council.

Combined Arts appeared as a heading in the accounts in 1988-89, but in the following two years, the same clients are listed in the accounts under 'Multi-disciplinary arts and arts centres', and at this point it looked as if combined arts had failed to become an established entity. However, in 1991-92 a new Combined arts unit was created, with that year's Annual Report stating: "The new unit was created to bring together, and respond to, activities which cross and merge art forms. The unit's responsibilities include schemes to assist artists who wish to work in a multi- and interdisciplinary way as well as areas transferred from other departments such as arts centres. Building Feasibility Studies, International Initiatives, Notting Hill Carnival and the Youth Fund" (p.13).

In the accounts, Combined arts once again replaced another category, this time "Multi-disciplinary arts and arts centres". Having first replaced community arts and then multi-arts, the transition of Combined Arts into the form expected of an Arts Council art-form was increasingly complete, with the focus on professional arts organisations and activities working within the boundaries of professional art-forms, albeit in an interdisciplinary way.

The category of Combined Arts had successfully achieved the status of an art-form category in the way that the Baldry Report had envisaged for community arts, an entity which, even with the recommendation of that report, had not been able to establish sufficient traction within the Arts Council to survive. The opening sentence of the following year's Combined Arts departmental report

confirmed the direction of travel: “A new and exciting range of work is being produced through collaboration between art forms” (p.12), and Combined Arts re-appeared as an advisory committee in the same year (1992-93).

The accounts for that year show a dramatic increase in expenditure, with the combined arts total spend listed at £14,702,863. Of this amount, £13,069,200 was allocated to the South Bank Centre, and £758,000 to the Institute of Contemporary Arts, with no other single grant more than £85,000. This demonstrated through the allocation of resources the commitment to art-form development through professional art-form specialist organisations.

In September 1994, the Combined Arts unit became a department in its own right, taking on added responsibilities for “strategic work in areas such as arts centres and festivals, and support for service organisations in arts and disability and cultural diversity” (1994-95, p.16). By the 1996-97 accounts the impact of this change was fully visible, with the following sub-headings: National Companies (of which there was one, the South Bank Board, £13,330,400); Regularly funded organisations (four, total value £1,097,100); Fixed-term funded organisations (nine, total value £317,000) Arts 2000 (one listing, £500,000); Black Arts Network (nine, five of which are Regional Arts Board, total value £37,500); Cultural diversity (three, £32,500), Digital artists and digital technology (seven, £7,000); International initiatives fund (seventy, £518,880); Live art development (ninety-five, £661,681); Notting Hill Carnival Bands (forty-five, £97,400); strategic initiatives (six, £39,300); Women in the arts (one, £11,000); Youth arts (two, £18,000).

The total spend of the department was £16,667,761, 9% of the total grant-in-

aid budget for the year, 80% of which went to the South Bank Centre. As with the detailed interrogation of the Music category in Chapter Five, the detail of the 'Combined Arts' art-form expenditure reveals the continuing focus on a relatively small number of client organisations which received the majority of the funding, organisations whose work could be understood from the perspective of the established art-form entities, coming into the category 'combined arts' either on the basis that multiple 'art-forms' were taking place in one physical space, or because there were examples of collaboration between those established entities. In other words, combined arts absorbed client organisations and activities that would be difficult to site within the individual art-form categories, but which were fundamentally aligned with the principles of the art-form as an entity. This was not the only role the 'Combined Arts' category performs, as it also provided a mechanism for containing and managing activities which did not demonstrate adherence to the preferred model of an art-form client organisation, or art-form definitions. These activities were placed within the project categories, a route which has already been identified as lower in value and vulnerable to change. The way in which the spend on combined arts was presented with the Annual Report does not distinguish between these two groups of activity, despite the very large differentials in funding, as listed above. In this way, the category of 'Combined Arts' provided a level of flexibility that enabled the structuring entities of art-form and client organisation to absorb the challenge presented by the radically different organising principles embedded for example within carnival, for very minor changes in funding distribution.

By 1995-96, the vast majority of funding continued to be directed through

grants to organisations, whether Regularly Funded Organisations (RFOs, the new name for client organisations, indicating that they received recurrent funding) or project recipients (which have to bid for each project for which they want funding). Of the total grant-in-aid in the year (£191,133,000), just over 94% was distributed either to regularly funded organisations or via project grants, 4% spent on management and services, and less than 2% spent on 'other activities', described in the narrative as "a very wide range of different initiatives comprising film production, promotion of the Contemporary Music Network, research, consultancies, publications and conferences". What is clear from this financial analysis is that picture of the Arts Council as patron, one which devolved decision making out to a separate layer of independent organisations had continued as the overwhelmingly dominant mode of operation.

8.4 From Funding to Investment

Although the art-form and the art-form client organisation both successfully survived this period, the way funding was described in the narratives of the Annual Reports changed significantly, with a move to present public expenditure as investment. This can be traced through the text, through the choice of graphics used within the text, and through the structural changes in the shape of the organisation itself.

Graphics, which in the previous period had focused on expenditure and how it was distributed between art-forms and geography (with the last example of this in the 1981-82 Annual Report), in this period begin to focus on demonstrating how much other income had been generated as a result of Arts Council funding. This starts in the 43rd Annual Report, with graphics under each art-form setting

out the income profile of revenue clients, showing the percentage of the Arts Council subsidy, LA (local authority) and other public subsidy, sponsorship income, and box office and other earned income. This first iteration of graphics is relatively low key, embedded within the text and imagery of the departmental reports, however by the following year, the graphic is up front and centre, with a stand out two-page spread, called 'Income analysis', immediately after the Secretary General's report. This provides the same analysis by art form and funding source as above, but in a very clear bar chart form. The information is reinforced by the accompanying text which states that:

"These two pages illustrate the income sources of the Council's main revenue clients in England.

The graphs show that the total economy of the arts has increased while the proportion of public subsidy to the arts has decreased. There has been a substantial increase in earned income and sponsorship" (p.7).

There are two particular points to note about this statement, the first the move from expenditure to income, which reflects the need to demonstrate a return on investment, and a fundamental shift taking place in relation to the argument for public funding of the arts as first noted in *The Glory of the Garden*, away from the supposed civilising social and personal benefits of exposure to excellent art, and towards economic benefits derived from effective investment; the second being the equivalence of the total economy of the arts with the income of the main revenue clients of the Arts Council, which reinforces the stability of the policy concept 'the arts' as coterminous with the operation of client organisations delivering a set of art-form activities within their very specific Arts Council derived

definitions. The two-page spread appears again the following year, with exactly the same accompanying text. The income analysis graphic remains a staple of the Annual Report right through this period, varying in location and in the choice of art-form, however always with the mainstays of dance, drama, music and visual arts, and always reflecting the breakdown of income across Arts Council, other public subsidy, sponsorship and earned income.

The text, not unexpectedly, mirrors the graphics. The first mentions of sponsorship come early, before the *Glory of the Garden*, but are, if not grudging, not entirely enthusiastic (see for example the Secretary-General's report in the 1979-80 Annual Report). By 1984-85, this has completely changed, with the Chair's introduction enthusiastically embracing the role of sponsorship and the Secretary-General talking about a "positive and aggressive approach", to private sector funding. Public funding is increasingly described as investment, and in 1985-86 the publication of "A Great British Success Story" is heralded, a document explicitly designed to raise the profile of the value of investment in the arts sector to the UK economy. This positioning carries on right through to the 1995-96 Annual Report, which carries an article by Cameron Mackintosh, framed in the Chairman's introduction as an article on the relationship between the subsidised and unsubsidised arts, describing it as "one of the most powerful pieces of advocacy...for sustaining, not cutting, the very modest contribution the taxpayer makes to our share of Britain's third or fourth most important industry" (p.5). At the same time, the 1988-89 Chairman's Introduction calls back to previous discussions on the role of patronage, making an explicit link between government policy in relation to income tax and the responsibility of people with

significant wealth to inherit “the mantle of the great patrons of the 18th and 19th Century” (p.3).

Turning now to the structure of the organisation, and in particular “*How the Arts Council Works*” (published in 1989) an advocacy document designed to open up the operation of the organisation, and which sets out in detail the operational structure of the Arts Council, providing an insight in the way in which it absorbs the thinking and approaches of the turn to business. The document is explicit about the purpose of the Arts Council as a national body established to foster the arts throughout Britain, setting out its role as both funder and policy maker and advocate for the arts. Its role as funder continues to reflect the well-established pattern, with advisory panels supporting the allocation of funds to a “portfolio of arts organisations and projects” (p.3). Its role as policy maker and advocate however has developed considerably, with the document stating that: “It is involved in strengthening every area of arts management, offering advice, training and regular appraisals. It co-ordinates policies on issues such as education and access. And it helps the arts earn more income through assisting with sponsorship, marketing, and partnership with other agencies” (ibid). A number of actions are taking place here, not least the continuing use of the term ‘arts’ as short hand for the organisations revenue funded by the Arts Council. This view of what makes up the ‘arts’ is further reinforced by the way in which the organisation, from 1985, is structured into three divisions: the arts division, the services division, and the finance division. The separation of tasks between the arts and services division is informative: the arts division included all of the established art-form departments: Dance, Drama, Film, Video & Broadcasting,

Literature, Music, Touring, and Visual Arts (it is worth noting the presence of Touring in this list, although it is very clearly not an art-form, rather a method of distribution, it has established itself on the list of essential categories); the services division included Administration and Personnel as might be expected, but also Marketing & Resources, Planning & Development and the newly established Incentive Funding Unit. In order to understand the importance of these departments it is necessary to look in more detail at their make-up. Marketing and Resources first appears in relation to a post (Marketing and Resources Controller in the 1985-86 report) and for the first time in departmental reports in the 1987-88 report, where it describes itself as a "new department with new objectives" (p.24). It sets out its role as the "promoter of enterprise, partnership and efficiency in the arts" (ibid). The detail of the text makes it clear that the focus is on supporting client organisations to increase other sources of income, through marketing (to increase ticket income), and through sponsorship, individual giving and local authorities. Again, there is an assumption that the arts are co-terminous with the activities of Arts Council funded organisations. There is also an implicit positioning in relation to the role of audience as consumer. The Incentive Funding Unit was responsible for administering a new initiative offering one-off awards to client organisations on the basis of submitted plans for projected growth in earned and raised income, an activity designed to support the art form organisations which are clients of the Art-form departments. Finally, Planning and Development includes four sections: the Regional Unit, which was responsible for managing the grants going to the Regional Arts Associations, the Research and Statistics Unit, the Arts Access Unit (described as being "concerned with all aspects of increasing the involvement of disenfranchised

groups in the arts”), and the Education Unit. Again, their position within the services division places them as secondary or supportive to the arts division, rather than as distinct areas of work in their own right. It is important to note that a wholly new department was formed in 1994-95 to distribute lottery funds, headed up by a Director level post.

As was the case in the previous period, the operational structure of the Arts Council is enabling it to absorb and manage change within the bounds of the existing arts funding assemblage. The core remains the identified art-forms and support for the art-form specialist organisations. Incoming activities are held separately in the Services division, providing services both internally and to the client organisations of the Council. In particular, the placement of the Planning and Development demonstrates that the activities covered under that heading are carried out from the perspective of supporting client organisations, and therefore through the lens of the established art-form, rather than in any more independent way.

The other very visible change through this period is the presence of the audience, again both in the text and in graphical form. Until the late 1980s, the word audience or audiences made only fleeting appearances in the Annual Reports, with between five and eleven uses per year between the 1984-85 and the 1988-89 Annual Reports. However, the word then moves centre-stage, again both in graphics and in the narratives of the reports, from the 1989-90 Annual Report onwards, when there are twenty four uses of the word, and between fourteen and nineteen uses annually through to 1995-96. However, throughout this period there is no significant discussion of audience development, and the

vast majority of references feature in the art-form narratives describing the size or make-up of audiences for art-form focused activity. Audiences appear to be most relevant in relation to the income that they generate, and the close relationship between audience size and income is reflected in references to arts audiences 'holding up' during the recession (see for example the 1991-92 report (p.6)).

8.5 The National Lottery

The Arts Council was appointed as lottery distributor for one of the five good causes identified when the National Lottery was established in 1993, with Lottery funding starting to appear from the 1995 Annual report and accounts, the same year as the transition from the Arts Council of Great Britain to the Arts Council of England (when the committees for Scotland and Wales were given full independence as separate organisations). In the beginning lottery funds were only applied to capital projects, but very rapidly this was expanded to cover revenue projects as well. The major significance of lottery funds comes from the amount of funding available for the Arts Council to distribute, a near doubling of the amount the Arts Council was able to award. On a practical level, accounting for the lottery expenditure was managed separately to the grant-in-aid accounts, so it is possible to maintain a like for like comparison of grant-in-aid expenditure, which continued to include all the regularly funded organisations. However, those organisations could also apply for lottery funding and it is important to consider whether and how the arts funding assemblage affected the development of arts lottery funding. The guidelines handed to the Arts Council stipulated that lottery funds "should be spent predominantly on capital projects; that grants should be

made to organisations which had already raised significant partner funding; that funds should be used for public benefit, with particular emphasis on access for disabled people; and that applications should demonstrate quality in design and construction” (p.14 Annual Report and Accounts 1994-95). The Arts Council added four additional criteria: “the quality of artistic activities; their relevance to national, local and regional arts development; the role of artists in developing projects; and provision for education and marketing” (p.14). The first awards were made in March 1995, with the requirement on capital ensuring that the majority of the awards, both in number and in scale, went to building based organisations, with the South Bank Centre (an Arts Council client organisation) receiving by far and away the largest award in that first round. The 1995-96 accounts present the lottery as an opportunity to support activity that they had hitherto not be able to fund, including amateur groups and commercial arts enterprises (p.10). However, in the same year the early rush of applications starts to be managed through the development of lottery funding streams, for example the stabilisation fund, available to client organisations struggling to make their books balance. 1995-6 is the first year that lottery grants are shown in the accounts, and the detail of each award is shown by Regional Arts Board area, rather than art form, although the art forms appear as a second analysis, with accompanying bar chart. The two largest awards by a significant margin went to the Royal Opera House (£55m) and the Sadler’s Wells Foundation (£30m), both Arts Council client organisations, and both (going back to Chapter One) organisations which had come into existence because of the Arts Council. The accounts also describe in brief the assessment process, with grants assessed by the “Regional Arts Board, and through them, local authorities; the British Film

Institute; the London Film and Video Development Agency; the Crafts Council; the Arts Council's own specialist departments; and other appropriate agencies gave expert advice on every application that fell within their remit" (p.101). The presence of the Crafts Council and the Film agencies reflects the responsibility given to the Arts Council under the National Lottery Act 1993 to "address the needs of projects related to film and the moving image, and to "address the needs of projects related to the crafts" (p.102). Together these categories made up a relatively small amount of the overall awards, and it was the established art-forms which took the lion's share, applications that would have been assessed by the Arts Council's own art-form specialists, with whom the established client organisations had long standing relationships. The story of the lottery continues in the next section however the early signs were that although the fund was enabling a wider range of organisations and activities to be funded, the established art-forms and client organisations would be the major beneficiaries.

8.6 Working with Data

Data, other than the financial information which had always been at the heart of the reports and accounts, starts to appear in earnest during this period. In 2000, the Arts Council of England published *Artstat: Digest of Arts Statistics and Trends in the UK 1986/7-1997/8*. Although the publication itself is outside this chronological period, I am going to address its contents here first, as they are directly relevant to the point at hand, although it also sheds light on the pre-occupations of the later period both through the decision to publish and through the structure of the document itself. The publication describes itself thus:

"This publication aims to provide an overview of statistics relating to the

arts funding system in the United Kingdom...While the period under review involved significant changes in the structures for the administration of arts funding, and related policies tended to reflect the political economy of this period, the principal objectives of the arts councils and other funders of the arts went largely unchanged” (p.1)

It is notable that this statement focuses in on funding, despite its title which suggests a wider remit. Four of the six chapters in the publication are given over entirely to information about funding: the amount of subsidy, earned income and income from fundraising. This very much reflects the focus within the Annual Reports on income generation and public subsidy as investment to generate other income. One chapter focuses on information collected from the regularly funded organisations, and only one, the final chapter, focuses on participation. The range and quality of data available on engagement in the arts was demonstrably minimal throughout the period covered by *Artstat*, with only six pages of the 112 of the publication given over to attendance and participation data. Geography was not included as a relevant factor, in either the funding or the engagement data, although there were some measures demonstrating regional differences, and spend per head. At this point, there were no measures about differential engagement by ethnicity, disability, or socio-economic status. It references two surveys which collected arts data during the period in question: the British Market Research Bureau (BRMB) Target Group Index, within which the Arts Council started to commission a question in 1986; and the Research Group of Great Britain Omnibus Survey, within which the Arts Council commissioned questions in 1991.

In 1986, the Arts Council GB started to commission a question within the

BRMB Target Group Index, which garnered responses from around 24,000 adults across England, Wales and Scotland annually. For the first time in 1989-90, two pages of the Annual Report are devoted to a section called “Audiences for the arts”, which sets out the national levels of attendance over the past four years, drawing on data collected through the survey. There are a number of features immediately apparent from the 1989-90 graphic, firstly the categories, which are relatively unsurprisingly: ‘plays’, ‘opera’, ‘ballet’, ‘contemporary dance’, ‘jazz’, ‘classical music’, ‘art galleries/exhibitions’, ‘any of the seven’. The text alongside the graphic states: “The arts are in the mainstream of British life. Millions of people enjoy the arts”. The presentation of the data is very simplistic, with bar charts of attendance per year, and no detail to explain how the Target Group Index (TGI) survey data was collected or analysed. The presentation of audience data in graphical form continues throughout this period: between the start of the collection of TGI arts participation data in 1986/7 and 1991, the list of activities that were counted as arts participation were as follows: Classical ballet, classical music, contemporary dance, drama, gallery, jazz, music, opera, performing arts, touring, visual arts; with rock and pop added in 1991. It is important to note that what it not made clear from the use of the data in the graphics is that the TGI survey questions did not differentiate between funded and unfunded activity, and therefore that a significant number of people reporting that they had attended a play or gallery could well have been attending an unsubsidised activity, whereas the financial data presented in the same document, and with very similar headings, related specifically to Arts Council funding.

Slightly later in this period, data used as advocacy starts to appear in the Annual Reports, with in 1991-92, a graphic showing responses to a series of statements, including “7 out of 10 people (69%) support public funding of the arts”, “8 out of 10 people (79%) agree that arts and cultural activities help to bring together people in local communities”, and “7 out of 10 people (71%) agree that arts and cultural activities help to enrich the quality of their lives” (p.7). These statistics came from an analysis of data collected through the Omnibus Arts Survey commissioned by the Arts Council from Research Surveys of Great Britain (RSGB), with questions included in the RSGB’s General Omnibus Survey in June/July 1991. As with the TGI data, there is no discussion in the report to explain that the survey could not distinguish between activity funded by the Arts Council and other arts and cultural activity. The questionnaire used for the 1991 Omnibus Survey is presented in Appendix six. It has similarities with the TGI survey, and the overall approach of the questionnaire is familiar from the Taking Part Survey discussed in Chapter Five above. It uses art-forms as a main structuring principle, asks about attendance or participation ‘nowadays’ (following the TGI approach), and introduces questions around frequency of engagement. It quite clearly identifies itself as market research, names the senior Marketing Officer at the Arts Council as the key point of contact, and sets out three objectives for the survey:

“Assist in the preparation of a National Arts and Media Strategy for Great Britain

- To establish baseline information on attendance, participation and other forms of interest in arts and cultural activities together with attitudes to

funding, provision, access, education and the influence of broadcasting.

These figures will provide a basis for comparison through similar surveys to be conducted 3 years after the implementation of the National Arts and Media Strategy

- To obtain information which will help organisations receiving Arts Council funding to further develop their audiences” (p.1)

The questions in relation to media are specifically asking whether and how respondents use television, radio and pre-recorded media to engage with the identified arts categories, and whether or not this engagement increases or decreases their engagement with ‘live’ arts experiences. It is not so much the engagement through the media which is of interest, but whether that then has an impact on live audiences. The reference to a National Arts and Media Strategy as one of the objectives is informative: the Arts Council was requested by the then Minister of the Arts prepare this strategy, following a report by Richard Wilding into the structures through which government funds were used to support the arts in England (National Arts Media Strategy Monitoring Group 1992, p.168), and it is referenced heavily in the Annual Report of 1990-91, linked to the re-structure of the Arts Council and the Regional Arts Boards which also took place that year. However, by 1992-3 the only mention of the strategy is as a line in the accounts and by 1993-4 it has gone completely, and there is no trace of the ‘similar surveys’ to be conducted three years later. The published report “Towards a National Arts & Media Strategy (1992), which set out the proposed strategy is very much a ‘lost’ document, invisible in later policy discussions, despite what was a very substantial public consultation leading to

a comprehensive draft strategy, and a foreword which strongly intimates that the final strategy was to be published later that year, following approval by the funding bodies, a collaboration between the Arts Council, British Film Institute, Crafts Council and Regional Arts Boards. The draft strategy offered up a relatively radical development programme, one which would have undoubtedly provided a serious challenge to the arts funding assemblage as set out in this thesis, with statements such as “The arts which receive support from public funds are part of the broader picture of our cultural life. They have no special status because they are funded. Distinctions between ‘high’ and ‘low culture, between ‘commercial’ and ‘non-commercial’ arts, between professional and amateur, do not reflect the way that most people experience the arts” (p.5), and “Quality and cultural significance do not depend on art form labels or scale of operation: there is no hierarchy of art forms” (p.i, one of the eleven core principles underpinning the strategy). Thus, the major driver for the first national arts survey commissioned by the Arts Council came to nothing. However, the responses to the attitudinal questions in relation to public funding of the arts were picked up and used in the Annual Reports (see for example Annual Report 1991-92, p.7). When looking at the detail of the questions, the lead in to the attitudinal question is

“I’m now going to read out a number of things people have said about arts and cultural activities, that is, the sorts of things we have mentioned today. Please could you tell me, taking your answer from this card, how much you agree or disagree with each statement” (question 14, listed in appendix six).

The relatively broad list of art-form genres listed in the earlier questions extended much further than Arts Council funded art-form categories, however when the data collected via question 14 is presented in the Annual Reports there is no qualifying statement in relation to its use. In this way, the outcomes of the survey are supporting rather than providing any challenge to the arts funding assemblage: the findings are being used to help organisations already in receipt of Arts Council funding (the art-form entities), and the broader questions in relation to arts and media are being used to provide advocacy material.

The use of data from both the TGI and the Omnibus Survey appears to conflate the arts funding assemblage as understood by the Arts Council and the way in which the general public would understand terms such as ‘arts and culture’, ‘dance’, drama’ etc. The surveys themselves bring in a hinterland of rigorous data collection and are providing accurate data based on the questions asked. Following the position of Law and others as set out in Chapter Three, however provides a very different way of understanding the findings of the surveys, as both performing and performative of the assemblage in which they are situated.

8.7 Conclusion

Again, despite significant external challenges, the arts funding assemblage has come through intact. The Arts Council continues to take the primary role of a patron for the arts, funding art-form specific, professional client organisations. There is a greater overall number of organisations in receipt of Arts Council funding, with many more now involved through one-off project funding than as client organisations. However, the core established art-forms and within those,

the client organisations delivering a specific sub-set of activities, continue to dominate both through overall level of funds received, and in terms of their stability and continuity within the operating structures of the Arts Council. The emergence of Combined Arts as an art-form enables the assemblage to absorb activities that could otherwise present a significant challenge. Two significant new elements did emerge during this period: the description of funding as investment and the focus on the economic argument for the arts, and the increasing use of market research data, however their operationalisation within the Arts Council ties them back to the financial success of the client organisations, and therefore they are effectively recruited into the assemblage, rather than providing any form of challenge. This Chapter does however provide a significant challenge to the research question at the root of this thesis, in that the way research is brought into the Arts Council, primarily as a market research and advocacy tool, given the nature of the assemblage, demonstrates a very effective use of the technology: rather than failing, it absolutely served the purpose for which it has been recruited.

9. New Labour and a New Orthodoxy

9.1 Introduction

The election of the New Labour administration in May 1997 is a significant moment for this narrative. A new government department, the Department of Culture, Media and Sport, was created, and sports and arts appeared at the heart of the new administration, with leading proponents, not just of the established arts, but also contemporary popular culture, famously invited into Downing Street. This had an immediate impact on the Arts Council as exemplified by filmmaker David Puttnam's introductory essay in the 1996-97 Arts Council accounts (p.10). The DCMS took a far more directly interventionist approach than any previous government sponsor of the Arts Council, with funding agreements setting out specific targets for the Arts Council, agreements which attempted to draw on a very different concept of the purpose of government in supporting arts and culture. In this Chapter I show how two different arts realities collide, and the impact this had on the capacity of the Taking Part Survey to address the questions which led to its inception.

I again use the Arts Council's Annual Reports and Accounts as my core material, alongside an increasing number of Arts Council reports and studies, not just for their content, but also, as with the Annual Reports, in their

presentation. Material from and relating to the DCMS also now forms a core part of this narrative, and I use the same principles of analysis across the piece.

9.2 Government Intervention

As outlined above, the 1997 election led to the first directly interventionist central government policy for culture, and the first real markers of that change came through the Comprehensive Spending Review in 1998 and the establishment of the Policy Action Team 10 in 1999. These two activities collectively presented a major shift in the way central government approached culture but were not inherently linked as they came from two different aspirations for the new administration, the first part of the relationship between policy goals and the government expenditure, the second the aspiration to tackle what was described at the time as social exclusion, people excluded from the mainstream life of the country. Their interaction forms an important part of this narrative, with the theoretical underpinning of this section drawing heavily on Foucault's concept of eventalisation. Although it was not the first action of the incoming government, it is also important to articulate the level at which Treasury funding for the Arts Council increased in the period under discussion. Grant-in-aid funding (Treasury funding, not Lottery funding) for the Arts Council increased from £189.4m in 1998-9 to £243.5m in 2001-2, and further to £411m by 2005. The incoming government wanted more from the subsidized arts sector, but in return was willing to increase significantly levels of funding.

The Policy Action Teams were set up to look at how government policy could address what was called social exclusion, reporting to the Social Exclusion Unit set up by the incoming government as part of their new Downing Street

operation. PAT 10 was led by the new DCMS, with a remit to report on “best practice in using arts, sport and leisure to engage people in poor neighbourhoods...how to maximise the impact on poor neighbourhoods of government spending and policies on arts, sport and leisure.” (PAT 10 report, p.5). The goal of the report was to develop an action plan to “maximise the impact of arts, sport and leisure policies in contributing to neighbourhood regeneration and increasing local participation.” (Ibid, p.5). This explicit and directive approach to cultural policy was entirely novel: previous administrations had offered a guiding hand however decisions had always been couched ultimately as the responsibility of the Arts Council. The PAT 10 report represented a hugely significant change, not only in the way it described the role of arts and culture, but also with its direct request for the Arts Council to address government priorities: stating explicitly:

“Arts and sports bodies which receive public funds should be accessible to everyone and should work actively to engage those who have been excluded in the past...Arts and sports bodies should acknowledge that social inclusion is part of their business” (p.5).

PAT 10 provided its own definition of ‘arts’ to include “all forms of dramatic, musical or visual arts activity, in whatever high- or low-tech medium and in whatever style – whether ‘high’ or ‘low’. It includes, for example, opera, literature, photography, painting, mosaics for public spaces and woodcarving” (p.21). It acknowledged that consumption was important in supporting “personal inspiration and insight; community identity and pride” (p.21), but that its focus was on participation, and the potential for creative expression and co-operative

teamwork to support their four key indicators of health, crime, employment and education. The report presented a very different version of the role of arts and culture, drawing on a series of case studies coming in the main from organisations from the community arts tradition, the arts reality that had not been successful in establishing itself as part of the core work of the Arts Council in the 1970s, as described in Chapter Seven above. The report did not use art-forms as an organising category, and went further by talking about arts and sport, cultural and recreational activity as a collective entity, stating that they could make a difference to health, crime, employment and education, because of their capacity to develop individuals, build community identity and collective effort, and build positive links with the wider community (p.8). It highlighted what it saw as the barriers to this work, including short term approaches, lack of hard information, the way in which arts organisations saw arts in communities as peripheral to their work, and the focus on programme or policy criteria rather than community needs. PAT 10 drew far more closely on the version of culture as understood by Williams, than the aesthetic tradition which underpinned the establishment of the Arts Council. In discussing it here I am not uncritically endorsing the position it outlined, as embodies many of the challenges outlined in Chapter Two, in particular the doxological assumption that engagement in culture (whether high, low or other) is always a good thing. The point here is that the PAT 10 report provided a significant challenge to the existing arts funding assemblage. The recommended actions for the Arts Council, both as a lottery distributor and as a client of the DCMS, were significant and wide ranging. In the report, Arts Council of England was asked to:

“recognise explicitly that sustaining cultural diversity and using the arts to combat social exclusion and promote community development are among its basic policy aims. ACE should seek to devote resources specifically to community development objectives and ensure that its funded clients and Regional Arts Boards also contribute in their work to such objectives” (p.16)

This is a very different and far more proscriptive direction from government than previously seen, with in particular the request to recognise community development as a basic policy aim, very much reflecting the community arts reality. The detail of the recommendation went on to request “Proposals as to how ACE will tighten the social inclusion objectives and targets given its funding agreement with DCMS” (p.16). The DCMS itself is tasked with developing an effective research programme to:

“assess the impact on individuals of participation in arts/sports related activities...over a period of at least five to seven years. Such research should be formulated after a review of the existing national longitudinal surveys, to explore what they might reveal through secondary analysis of existing data and how such surveys might be used in future as a cost-effective way of delivering the research recommended here” (p.15).

The PAT 10 report attempted to put in place the policy requirements for a change in the approach to research and data and did so within the context of a report that had adopted a very different conception of the arts. The challenge developed as the two arts realities collided: on the one hand, a view of the arts as a broad based and often collective endeavour sitting within a spectrum of

activity also encompassing entertainment, sports and recreation, and on the other the long-developed Arts Council reality of the arts as the product of a relatively small number of professional, publicly funded client organisations. The publication of the PAT 10 report led to a number of specific outcomes relevant to this narrative, particularly the inclusion of targets within the DCMS public service agreements which fed into the DCMS ACE funding agreements, and the development of an explicit DCMS research strategy, both of which are discussed in more detail below.

The first Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) took place before the work of the PAT 10 report, however I have approached the two in this order, to allow the proper situating of the outcomes of the PAT 10 report within the ongoing process of the targets set for the DCMS as a result of the CSR, and which were then forwarded on into the funding agreements with the Arts Council. The CSR characterised itself as the first comprehensive linkage of government aims and objectives to spending policies, enabling the setting of clear and quantifiable targets for government departments (HM Treasury, July 1998). The review established a set of aims and objectives for each department, followed up by the development of Public Service Agreements (PSA), again with each department (HM Treasury, December 1998). These agreements set out objectives accompanied by explicit, measurable targets, alongside the budget allocation for each Department. There were to be regular monitoring and progress reports, with targeted intervention for departments failing to deliver, however there would not be any financial penalties. The DCMS objective from the first CSR most relevant to this thesis was objective 2, to “broaden access for this and future

generations to a rich and varied cultural and sporting life and to our distinctive built environment”, with the specific targets linked to that objective as follows:

“(viii) access to the performing arts will increase by attracting new audiences over the next three years, with 300,000 new opportunities to experience the arts. New companies, new work and new venues will be funded and the New Audiences programme will continue to widen access to the arts

(x) extend social inclusiveness by increasing the involvement of identified priority groups in each of the sectors the department has responsibility for;

(xiii) 200,000 new educational sessions undertaken by arts organisations;

(xiv) funding of non-departmental public bodies (NDPBs) will be conditional on quantified improvements in outputs, efficiency, access, promoting quality, and income generation/private sector funding, monitored by a new independent watchdog.” (Public Services for the Future: Modernisation, Reform, Accountability, Comprehensive Spending Review: Public Service Agreements 1999-2002).

Placing these targets within the narrative of this thesis foregrounds a set of challenges for the DCMS. Firstly, the arms-length principle dictated that it did not specify policy to the Arts Council, however these targets were specific, and as the Arts Council itself had positioned itself as a patron rather than a delivery vehicle, targets passed on to it needed to be recycled again into a third set of agreements, between the Council and its clients. Secondly, the targets

generated a need for measurement, including measurement of the engagement of priority groups (here showing the early impact of the work of the Social Exclusion Unit), an area for which there was very little data, or capacity to collect data at that time. The first set of funding agreements between DCMS and the Arts Council, covering the period 1999 to 2006 provide a location for understanding how these challenges were approached. The early agreements show evidence of fluidity and change: there are three agreements, each superseding the previous one, between 1999 and 2001, the third explicitly stating that it is an interim, with relative stability only appearing with the fourth agreement, which covers the period 2003-6. What can be seen across these agreements is the start of the translation of the PSA targets given to DCMS into a framing that fits with the arts funding assemblage. The early agreements set out ten goals:

- 1) to encourage excellence at every level;
- 2) to encourage innovation at every level;
- 3) to promote a thriving arts sector and support the creative economy;
- 4) to facilitate more consumption of the arts by more of the people;
- 5) to facilitate more participation in the arts by more of the people;
- 6) to encourage more relevant training for the arts sector;
- 7) to encourage better use of arts in education in schools, and in lifelong learning;
- 8) to develop and enhance the contribution the arts make to combatting social exclusion and promoting regeneration;
- 9) to improve public perceptions of the arts; and,
- 10) to promote British culture overseas.

The texts of the agreements demonstrate that the process of agreeing and defining targets was not straightforward: the 2000 agreement reflects that it had not been possible to arrive at an objective measurement of excellence, and therefore a statement with examples showing how funded organisations demonstrated excellence would be the accepted mechanism. Similarly, the difficulty for the Arts Council in meeting goal 4, given its relatively limited influence over a rigidly defined definition of art forms is acknowledged (funding agreement 2000-02, p.7), with the solution being the development by ACE of more relevant indicators through a survey commissioned to provide baselines for consumption and participation, which became the second iteration of the Omnibus Survey first described in Chapter Eight above.

Further evidence of the complexity of these early negotiations comes from the June 1999 Memorandum submitted by ACE to the DCMS Select Committee, which firmly reiterated the arms-length principle and sets out the Council's own goals, stating:

“ACE formulates its own policy priorities for the arts with reference to the DCMS goals. ACE has recently agreed the following priorities for the coming three-year period:

- New work, experimentation and risk, and the centrality of the individual artist, creator or maker.
- New arts forms and collaborative ways of working, often in or with new technology.
- Diversity and public inclusion with special reference to race, disability and economic class.
- Children, young people and lifelong learning.
- Touring and distribution including through broadcasting, recording

and electronic publishing.

ACE will deliver against its priorities for the arts, which in turn serve the DCMS high level goals. ACE's independence in its delivery of its priorities for the arts is uncontested" (June 1999 Memorandum downloaded from <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm199899/cmselect/cmcumeds/506/9062402.htm>)

Here, the Arts Council is reiterating its independence, and making the case that it will achieve the DCMS targets in parallel to those of its own, which have been agreed with awareness of, but separately to those of the DCMS. The priorities as set out in the memorandum draw far more heavily on the trajectory outlined in the previous three Chapters, than on the language or the stated intentions of the new government department. By the time the funding agreements between the DCMS and the Arts Council had stabilised, they owed far more to the Arts Council position than to the ambitions set out in the PAT 10 report. This is illustrated by reference to an example of the detail of a PSA target for the DCMS as included with the Arts Council funding agreement, to increase by 500,000 the number of people attending the arts by March 2004, with attendances defined as attending one or more of: a play or drama; an exhibition of photography, drawing, painting, printing, sculpture or installation art; a poetry/book reading, performance poetry or other literature event; a performance of opera/operetta; a classical music concert; a jazz concert; live dance, including ballet, contemporary dance, African people's dance, South Asian dance or some other dance; or a crafts exhibition at least twice in the last 12 months. This list is drawn directly from the questions used with the Target Group Index and Omnibus Survey, which had been developed primarily to meet the developing market

research needs of Arts Council client organisations.

At the same time, the government's own understanding of the purpose of state funding for arts and culture is not stable: statements by successive secretaries of state highlight an uncertainty or ambivalence in relation to which version of the arts and culture was to be championed, a point made by Selwood (2006, p.39). This is exemplified in Chris Smith's *Creative Britain* (1998), which in its introduction states "The deepest cultural experiences will frequently come, for all of us, from the heights of fine opera or the sweeping sounds of a classical orchestra or the emotional torment of high drama. But we shouldn't ignore the rest of cultural activity at the same time" (p.4). The same text powerfully demonstrates the enduring strength of the Romantic view of the role of culture, with the first of Chris Smith's five roles for culture being personal fulfilment:

"this is partly an educative process, helping to draw out the imaginative thought and creative ability that is present in all of us. But it is also about helping to lead each and every one of us into a glimpse of a deeper world than exists simply on the surface. This was of course the great insight of the Romantics, 200 years ago" (p.23)

Smith summarises his view of the contribution creativity makes to civil society as "fulfilment; identity; inclusion; challenge; and useful beauty" (p.24), in doing so drawing on multiple intellectual traditions, not all compatible with his department's own requirement to measure engagement.

Two speeches published as separate chapters within *Creative Britain* between them characterise the ambiguity at the heart of this position. The first "A Vision for the Arts" is very clearly focused on the arts as defined in relation to the Arts

Council art-form definitions and the desire for the arts to become “much more a part of our everyday lives” (p.44), finishing with a quote from William Hazlitt: “They (*the fine arts*) do not furnish us with food or raiment it is true; but they please the eye, they haunt the imagination, they solace the heart. If, after that you ask the question, *Cui bono?* there is no answer to be returned” (p.47). The second “In a Great Tradition: The British Music Industry” talks almost exclusively from the economic perspective, outlining the very significant economic value of the UK recording industry, and finishing with a call for investment “We have a complex home market...and there is much for A and R funding to find and develop...This is why we deserve and will repay, investment” (p.84). The two speeches were made to very different audiences, the first to the Annual Dinner of the Royal Academy (May 1997) and the second to The Recording Industry Association of America (October 1997), however both were curated into the overall *Creative Britain* text as examples of cultural policy. It is therefore appropriate to use a comparison of the two to understand the different arts realities in play and the very different conceptions of the role and purpose of the different realities: ‘the arts’ should be supported by government and experienced by everyone because of their capacity to improve; popular music should be supported because of its role in the economy. In both cases, the concomitant role that a cultural economy perspective would bring, that they are both at the same time cultural and economic, has been lost. Subsequent post-holders demonstrated a similar ambivalence or uncertainty: Tessa Jowell, who was Secretary of State at the time that the Taking Part Survey was commissioned, demonstrates a firming up of the Romantic view of culture, with her definition of the difference between culture and entertainment, stating that:

“There is no easy dividing line between the two, but one definition which works better than most is that “culture” as opposed to entertainment is art of whatever form which makes demands not only on the maker or performers but on those to whom the work of art or performance is directed – whether it be a new piece by Moti Roti or a piano work by Schubert. This is the element of “culture” I want to single out for attention” (2004, p.4).

Art under this definition requires effort or work, ‘making demands’ of the recipient, taking us straight back to Hunter’s (1992) description of Kantian aesthetics as a technology of the self as discussed in Chapter Three, and which places the emphasis on the importance of the interaction between the viewer and a finished work of art, rather than, as the PAT 10 report did, placing the emphasis on participation in creation. In the same paper Jowell talks about a transcendental sixth sense, again drawing on the aesthetic notion of culture:

“Those who have, however it has come about, had the transcendent thrill of feeling, through chance exposure or patient study, the power of great art in any medium, have gained the use, however seldom or often they may use it, of a sense to add to those of touch, taste, smell, sound and sight. And grappling with the complexity is almost always the necessary condition of access to that enriching sixth sense. I am not saying that culture has to be complicated, or that what is not complicated cannot have cultural value. But I do believe that the rewards of grappling with great art in any medium are enormous. The reluctance of so many to attempt that challenge is a terrible waste of human potential, with a concomitant loss of human realisation” (p.6).

Jowell goes on to argue that this is why subsidy for “high culture” is a “proper task for government”, not to subsidise nights out for the wealthy, but to help more people benefit from great art. By this point, Jowell has reverted almost wholly back to the same position which influenced Keynes and others at the outset of the Arts Council, losing entirely the broader potential indicated through the work of the PAT 10 report. This ambivalence at the top of the DCMS is reflected in the way that both the PSA agreements with HM Treasury, and the subsequent funding agreements with the Arts Council are drafted, enabling the established position of the arts funding assemblage to hold sway.

9.3 The Challenge of Demonstrating Impact

Once DCMS and ACE had reached a somewhat uneasy truce over the rules of engagement, and the returns required for the significant increase in funds, the question that had remained to be answered was how the Arts Council could provide evidence of meeting the targets set out in its funding agreements.

I start my consideration of this question by returning to *Artstat: Digest of Arts and Statistics and Trends in the UK 1986/87- 1997/8*, published by Arts Council England in 2000, which first appeared towards the end of the last Chapter. This is an important text as it reflects the contemporary perspective and understanding of the role of information and data for the arts sector at the time. In this instance, it is the structures and categories used to manage the information, rather than the statistical information itself which is of primary interest.

The opening line of the introduction states that the purpose of the document is “to provide an overview of statistics relating to the arts funding system in the

United Kingdom.” (p.1). Here, the appearance of the word funding, which was not present in the title, makes it clear that the primary focus of the digest is on the use of statistics to understand and support arts funding. Therefore, at least within the Arts Council, the understanding of the purpose of statistics in the arts was primarily in relation to finance and funding. The introduction addresses recent significant political and administrative change, arguing that despite the changes in the administrative structure of arts funding, and the role of politics in funding policy, “the principal objectives of the Arts Councils and other funders of the arts went largely unchanged” (p.1). This statement is both re-affirms the arms-length principle (that government funds but does not set specific policy objectives for the Arts Council), and at the same time hints that the role of evidence is not to help with the consideration of what the objectives might be, but only how already extant objectives were to be supported.

Four of the six chapters in the publication focus wholly on the statistics of finance and funding; a further chapter sets out information from the regularly funded organisation (client organisation) performance indicators; and only one chapter focuses on engagement, the who is taking part in the activity, rather than the how of its funding. The opening paragraph of the foreword states:

“In an increasing complex funding environment, it is critical that all those who are actively involved in the cultural sector have access to reliable and comprehensive statistical information. The arts funding bodies have a key role to play in collecting and disseminating that information...This report marks an important milestone in that process” (p.V).

The deeply embedded nature of the relationship between information and

income is further demonstrated in the statement in relation to visual arts “Reliable data on the visual arts sector have traditionally been hard to come by. Various factors have contributed to this: the prevalence of free admission galleries makes accurate recording of audiences difficult...” (p.90): without a financial transaction no information about the person taking part or experiencing culture is recorded. On the one hand, this sounds entirely reasonable, but when reconsidered, it reflects the deep structural relationship that had developed between the gathering of information and the financial transaction. Little or no consideration had been given as to the why or how of collecting information in the absence of that transaction. Despite the rhetoric about the role of arts and culture outside of finance, no detailed consideration had been given as to how to quantify or measure that role, even at the most basic level of who was taking part. This lack of data about engagement in free cultural activity can be contrasted with the section which details the change over time of the net income yield per ticket from the Royal National Theatre in comparison to the Royal Shakespeare Company. The collection and analysis of accurate and highly detailed information was clearly recognised and valued, but almost wholly in relation to financial return.

The other key area to note is the definition of arts that is in play. The document is clear that it refers only to publicly funded professional arts, with the introduction to chapter 5 stating:

“This chapter concentrates largely on the activities of the regularly funded organisations of the four national Arts Councils and the Regional Arts Boards in England. The authors acknowledge that this places limitations on the scope of the chapter...It is important for readers to

consider the data that follow describe part of the artistic fabric of the UK, rather than the whole” (p.65).

Some data from commercial theatre is used (mainly because two organisations: TMA (Theatrical Management Association) and SOLT (Society of London Theatres) had been collecting detailed information on theatre attendances and income yield for the benefit of their members), but in the main the focus is on publicly funded provision, a point acknowledged by the authors, but which, as evidenced in the last Chapter in relation to the graphics presented in the Annual Report, was a nuance that was easily lost.

The next vital pieces of information contained within the document relate to the categories used to collect and present the data. The first step is the identification of art forms. As might be expected, the art forms are used as the fundamental building blocks for generating statistics in relation to the overarching entity of the ‘arts’. There are variations in the precise art-form categories, for example between the table presenting Arts Council of Great Britain/Arts Council of England expenditure by art form (table 2.3) and the table presenting Arts Council of England Lottery: capital (table 3.4). The former uses the word art-form to describe budget holding Arts Council departments, the latter uses the slightly different lottery funding categories: in their very differences the use of the word art-form as coterminous with budgetary divisions is further reinforced, with the term art-form effectively straddling the territory between the activity and the funding of the activity. The use of a similar art-form list in the chapter focusing on business funding for the arts, which draws on data gathered by the Association of Business Sponsorship of the Arts (ABSA) demonstrates the extent to which

the categorisation of the arts has become naturalised. It makes sense that an organisation (ABSA) working to achieve sponsorship for arts organisations, many of whom are also funded by the Arts Council, would use the same definitions as the Arts Council, if only for ease of use; but in doing so, the categories become ever more fixed and harder to shift, and therefore what is included or excluded, visible or invisible, becomes more fixed as well. When the Digest turns to data derived from the performance indicators of the Art Council regularly funded clients, it demonstrates the way in which the internal definitions of the art-forms have been maintained and embedded, and detailed consideration re-opens the process of inscription that has taken place through the Arts Council use of the term art-form. The section on performing arts covers “data on professional opera, dance, music and drama” (p.71). Immediately the data is confined to professional activity. There are then sub sections covering, in order: opera, dance (effectively ballet, with information from Royal Ballet, Birmingham Royal Ballet, English National Ballet, Northern Ballet, Rambert, Richard Alston, Scottish Ballet), music (wholly focused on orchestras), drama (providing high levels of detail about the Royal National Theatre and Royal Shakespeare Theatre). What might from the outside be considered quite broad categories are, when inspected further, focused on very specific artistic genres and organisations: music when considered as part of the ‘arts’ is orchestral, dance is ballet, and so on. There is a simplicity at work here: the music department of the Arts Council funds orchestras, so orchestras are what it needs to monitor. The risk comes in when orchestras become music, when the detail of what is and what is not included within the category ‘music as an artform’ is lost.

Why this matters so much as the Arts Council moves towards more detailed data collection becomes clear when looking at the final chapter of the Digest, *“Data on participation in and consumption of the arts”*. The range and quality of data available on engagement in the arts is demonstrably minimal at this point. Geography is not included as a relevant factor, in either the funding or the engagement data and there are no measures about differential engagement by ethnicity, disability, or socio-economic status. In other words, the categories that were valued in relation to publication were solely in relation to the role of the participant in generating income in relation to the identified art-forms. This focus underpins the primary importance of funding: understanding the breakdown on engagement against the funded art form categories allows the data on spend to be allocated accordingly. In this context, the logic for these categories become clear and understandable: the focus of the statistics covered within Artstat is on the professional organisations that are considered as producers of the entity known as arts, with the primary focus of the data collection to support their ability to fund their ongoing activity through a combination of state contributions, earned income, and fundraising.

The implicit working definition of arts as covered by the Artstat digest is simply those activities that are state funded, at a time when understanding the potential for earned income as part of a process of developing a ‘business case’ had become important. When the purpose of the statistics is to understand the effect of the public funding on publicly funded activities, rather than addressing the overall question of population wide arts engagement, the use of this implicit definition can appear unproblematic. However, it becomes problematic when it

carries forward that implicit definition and embeds it into statistics collected in relation to arts engagement. The reappearance of the categories in the later Taking Part survey supports the recurring theme of this thesis: the capacity of the arts funding system, once established, to maintain its core structure despite seemingly incompatible political positions. This reappearance provides a window onto the process through which this is achieved, with the retention of the categories of possibility for what is included in the term 'arts' retained even as the system moves through the different policy discourses.

Reading the Artstat Digest as documentary evidence demonstrates the tight hold of the arts funding assemblage, and the increasingly important role of methods in that assemblage. This document, however, only covers activity up to 1997, and there were significant developments in relation to data and research from 1997 onwards, both for the Arts Council and for its sponsoring body the DCMS, and it is those developments which I discuss next.

9.4 Development of Research and Evidence in relation to state funding

The focus on meeting the evidential requirements of the funding agreements as well as the government's wider focus on evidence-based policy, had a significant impact on both the Arts Council and on the new government department for culture. The Arts Council's own publication archive highlights the increased internal focus on research and evidence, starting in the mid-1990s and increasing rapidly from 1997 onwards. The ACE research report number 1 was published in 1995, numbers 3 to 7 in 1996, and by 2000 the Council had published twenty-one research reports: the research department, supported by

the increased use of evidence-based policy making within central government, had found a stable home within the organisation.

At the same time, as described both in the previous Chapter and in the section above, the Arts Council had also started to engage with the world of market research and the associated hinterland of the large-scale sample survey, initially through the TGI survey, and then through a slightly larger question set administered via the RSGB Omnibus Survey in 1991. The outcomes of that initial engagement were two-fold: market research to support the capacity of the Council's client organisations to generate earned income; and the generation of advocacy material to support the Arts Council's case for public funding of the arts; with proposed use of the data to support a national arts and media strategy fallen by the wayside. The conclusion at the end of the previous Chapter acknowledged that the use of research and data in this way was, understood from within the arts funding assemblage, highly effective. As the proposed national arts and media strategy did not come into being, plans to revisit the Omnibus Survey in order to measure the impact of the strategy were no longer necessary, and other than the TGI data, no further national data was collected until 2000.

By 2000, as outlined above, the political landscape had changed dramatically, the DCMS had come into being, the target driven funding agreements between DCMS and the Arts Council were starting to become stabilised, and the Arts Council's own research department was very active. Publications such as *Measuring the economic and social impact of the arts, A review*, the Arts Council of England Research Report 24 (Reeves 2002) demonstrate a wide

understanding of contemporary questions and issues in relation to the impact of the arts, albeit much more from an applied than a critical cultural policy perspective. For example, Reeves highlights the need for longitudinal research to evaluate the contribution of the arts (p.67), and discusses ways in which the Arts Council plans to carry out such work, through for example the New Audiences Fund project to develop, test and evaluate different evaluation methodologies for different models of arts projects addressing social inclusion (notably, in this example all the models are based around the presence of a funded arts organisation, showing how embedded the client organisation was in the Arts Council's understanding of how 'the arts' were to be done, losing an opportunity to explore the potential of non-publicly funded protagonists to contribute to the field).

It is within this context that the Arts Council returned to the Omnibus Survey, commissioning work in 2001 including a pilot and a further survey, and then another follow-up survey in 2003. The detail of the question sets used in the 2001 pilot, the main 2001 survey and in the subsequent 2003 survey are all set out in appendix seven. The stated aims for the survey module (Omnibus Monthly Instructions July 2001, see also Corbin 2001) were to:

“assess levels and frequency of attendance at arts and cultural events
assess levels and frequency of participation in arts and cultural activities
measure attitudes towards public subsidy of the arts and the value of
the arts”.

The link between the survey and policy is clear: the Arts Council needed to report on progress in relation to attendance and participation in the arts, because

this was one of its DCMS performance indicators as set out in the funding agreements between DCMS and the Arts Council discussed above. The survey was designed to enable the Arts Council to profile both attenders and non-attenders, and target activity accordingly. The Arts Council published its own research reports to set out the findings of the surveys (Jermyn et al 2001, Skelton et al 2002, Fenn et al 2003), and the data was used by academics and researchers including Chan and Goldthorpe (2005, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). Although the survey was updated from the 1991 version, further refined following the pilot, and again between 2001 and 2003, the underlying structure very much reflects the 1991 survey which, as has already been established, was driven by the desire for market research and advocacy material to support its own position and that of its client organisations, and which drew its framing from the stabilised arts funding assemblage, in particular the use of funded art-forms to define what counts as 'the arts'.

The importance of that framing is shown by the structure of the 2003 report (Fenn et al, 2003) which, within the executive summary, has sub-headings as follows: combined arts, dance, drama and theatre, literature, music, visual arts and crafts, barriers to engagement in the arts, attitudes to the arts, regional engagement with the arts. These sub-headings reflect both the established art-form categories and established themes in relation to engagement, with the themes around engagement all framed in relation to a stabilised overarching category called 'the arts'.

There are two points to raise here, firstly the way in which the category 'the arts' is understood, and the second the impossibility from the surveys of

identifying whether the activity had received public funding. The latter is made visible in the 2003 report, with the authors recognising that they could not link up data from the surveys with box office data, and therefore were unable to carry out any analysis of the specific role of public subsidy using the survey data (p.20 and p.22), however as outlined in the previous Chapter in relation to the 1991 survey findings, this issue is not highlighted in relation to use of the data for advocacy purposes in the Annual Reports. Possible problems with the definition of the term 'the arts' are not picked up in the report, although the more limited range of art-form categories used in the TGI survey is mentioned (p.21).

It is however possible to explore the problem of definitions by referring to a separate but contemporary research report issued by the Arts Council, *Arts, What's In a Word: Ethnic Minorities and the Arts* (Jermyn and Desai, 2000), which drew on qualitative survey work to understand ethnic minority engagement with the arts. One of the key findings from that qualitative research was that: "the dominant images people had of the arts were opera, ballet, Shakespearean theatre, classical music and art in galleries (particularly abstract modern art). Many found this image off-putting and elitist and assumed that such events were mainly for "posh" people, those over 35, and White people" (p.ii). This clearly demonstrates the success of the arts funding assemblage as described in this thesis: the list of activities given back to the researchers by the respondents very much mirrored the established Arts Council art-form categories, despite the fact that before 1945 the UK had not had significant traditions in either opera or ballet, and that the Royal Shakespeare Company only came into existence in its current form in 1961, receiving its first Arts Council subsidy in 1963. Jermyn and Desai

discuss ways in which the Arts Council and arts organisations could overcome this perception of ‘the arts’, but consideration of how the detail inscribed within the phrase ‘the arts’ could affect other research does not appear to have been raised.

Corbin (2001, p.12-13) discusses evidence from the Omnibus Survey pilot that respondents did not want to admit to not taking part in the arts, as a result of which “activities and events such as visiting the library, museum or gallery, stately home, castle or palace , or well-known gardens have been added to the survey with the aim of making it more inclusive and less off-putting” (p.13), but again this is not picked up other than as a technical issue.

Unlike the Arts Council, the DCMS was a new entity and very much finding its way in the late 1990’s and early 2000s, having come into being as part of a New Labour administration which identified itself with evidence-based policy making. An early indication of its desire to garner more information about the impact of the sectors within its domain came when it commissioned a set of questions in Office of National Statistics General Household Survey 2002-3, working with Sport England, UK Sport and Arts Council England.

There had been a sport and leisure question set in the survey going back to 1987, however this was the first time ‘arts’ questions had been included, with the arts considered ‘specialised leisure’: “Specialised leisure activities (the arts) refers to singing or playing an instrument, dancing, painting, writing stories or poetry, and performing in a play” (Fox 2004, p.5). Notably, the General Household survey questions only asked about participation. The DCMS did not have the same interest in marketing and advocacy as the Arts Council, and its

developing position on research is most clearly seen in the DCMS Strategic Plan 2003, and the associated DCMS Research Strategy.

The 2003 Strategy states: “Together with local government and our NDPBs, we will develop a stronger evidence base for culture, to identify and spread good practice, and to provide better support for those arguing the case locally for funding for libraries, cultural and sporting services” (DCMS, 2003a p.13). The DCMS Research Strategy 2003-2006 (DCMS, 2003b) articulates the DCMS desire “To increase relevant socio-economic policy research and embed evidence in DCMS’s work and thinking at all levels and stages in the policy process so as to ensure that the policies developed have maximum impact on key priorities and delivery targets” (p.3).

There is a clear attention to developing the capacity of the department to deliver EBP (evidence-based policy) ahead of the next comprehensive spending review (p.4), and evidence that there was a desire to understand the impact of creative, cultural and sporting activities on wider social and economic policy issues (p.36). The practice of working across the spectrum of activity covered by the DCMS evidenced by the commissioned module in the General Household Survey took a decisive step forward with the launch of the Taking Part Survey in 2005, with sections covering sports, arts, libraries and heritage, all encompassed within the framework of a national statistic designed to provide the evidence necessary to demonstrate success (or otherwise) in relation to the targets set out in the agreement between the DMCS and HM Treasury.

The development in 2007 of the local government national indicator set provided a new measurement challenge for the DCMS, as it required the capacity

to 'see' impact at the local authority level, something that was not possible through the Taking Part Survey. The local government indicators were developed in response both to central government's drive towards EBP and the desire to ensure that local and national government were working in an aligned manner (see for example the CLG White Paper *Strong and Prosperous Communities* 2006), and to the 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review, the stated aim of reducing the burden of reporting from local to national government, and to the associated introduction of Local Area Agreements, agreements between central government and local authority areas designed to set out the basis on which central government funding was awarded (similar to the Public Service Agreements between HM Treasury and central government departments).

The indicators were derived from the Public Service Agreements and Departmental Strategic Objectives announced in the 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review, demonstrating the strong link between central government policy and the priorities passed on from central to local government. The DCMS departmental strategic objective, *encourage more widespread enjoyment of culture and sport* was reflected in National Indicators 8, 9, 10 and 11 (p.13 CLG, 2008). A key part of the implementation of the indicators was the choice by Local Strategic Partnerships of up to 35 designated targets to reflect local priorities, with the chosen indicators forming the basis of a performance management framework for each area.

The relevant indicator for the arts was NI11: engagement in the arts. This was a new indicator, without any previously collected relevant dataset (ibid, p.32). Data collection for the indicator was added into the Active People Survey

commissioned by Sport England with targets based on the percentage of adults (16+) who had engaged in the arts at least three times in the past 12 months.

Sport England had established the Active People Survey (APS) at much the same time as the Taking Part Survey. The purpose of APS was to provide a detailed picture of key performance indicators at an operational level: as part of the process of developing their relationship with local authorities, Sport England had identified a key set of indicators around physical activity, which were measured through the Active People Survey. Levels of physical activity were promoted as an important proxy for health, recognised as a key driver for securing local authority investment, and collecting data that was robust at the local authority level was an essential part of this process. In contrast, the Taking Part Survey had not set out to provide data that could be useable at the local authority level as it was initially established to measure performance against national targets. Therefore, when the national indicator set was in development, it became necessary to find another way to collect local authority level data for the other DCMS areas of responsibility, in order to make the case for the set of DMCS indicators within the overall suite of indicators. The addition to the Active People Survey of a short set of additional questions (described above in Chapter Five) provided a statistically robust and affordable method to provide the necessary data.

9.5 How about the Assemblage?

Working through the Annual Reports and Accounts and associated Arts Council documentation from 1997 onwards shows that the art-form and the art-form organisations continue to be core structuring entities, as does the conception

and reality of the Arts Council's role predominantly as funder of designated art-form organisations. In the early years of this period, the art-form categories continue to appear in the report and accounts, with the one significant change being the move of the Royal Opera House into the Combined Arts category (known briefly as the collaborative arts). The reports highlight significant structural change in the Arts Council itself, most notably on 1 April 2002 when the Arts Council of England and the regional arts boards merge into a single organisation, known as Arts Council England, with regional offices. From the year of the merger onwards the art-form categories disappear from the audited accounts (starting with the 2002-3 accounts) replaced with an alphabetical list of grant aided organisations. However, the art-form category was clearly still in use, as it is used to frame the publication of the annual submissions by Regularly Funded Organisations (organisations in receipt of multi-year core funding from the Arts Council).

This continued right through the Labour administration and beyond, as evidenced by the 2016 House of Commons briefing paper, *Arts Funding: Statistics* (Dempsey, 2016). Table A9, NPO¹ funding by artform, shows a breakdown as follows: Combined Arts (in 2011/12 22% of funding), Dance (11%), Literature (2%), Music (21%), Not art form specific (1%), Theatre (31%), Visual Arts (12%). Both the art-form category and the art-form specific organisation have made it through. The briefing paper also highlights breakdown by region,

¹ national portfolio organisation, the name post 2010 for organisations in receipt of multiple-year core funding from the Arts Council

and, from 2013/14, the concept of the national organisation reappears, with ten organisations: Birmingham Royal Ballet, English National Ballet, English National Opera, Northern Ballet, Opera North, Royal National Theatre, Royal Shakespeare Company, Southbank Centre and Welsh National Opera, defined as “organisations which have a significant national reach beyond their home region” (p.32). In terms of presentation, this means that the funds awarded to those organisations are taken out of their regional locations and placed into a separate national category, exactly the same procedure identified in Chapter Six as part of the management of the regional question, and first carried out in the 1969-70 Annual Report and Accounts. The number of organisations so designated has grown from four in 1969-70 to ten in 2013-14, however the original four are all still present, and nine of the ten very much within the art-form categories as they were first envisaged in 1945, the tenth being the Southbank Centre, a multi-artform venue based in the centre of London.

9.6 Conclusion

The New Labour government provided the most significant and direct challenge to the arts funding assemblage, in the shape of PAT 10 and the Social Exclusion Unit, with the explicit championing of an alternative arts reality, drawing far more on the community arts tradition than that of the long-established arts funding assemblage. However, the lock held to a very significant extent. In this case the key factors in the success of the lock came more from the institutional networks than any fractionality of the different arts realities. In particular, the double

distance between government and delivery, passing through first the Arts Council and then its client organisations, meant that the proposed policy change still had to pass through the established assemblage.

10. Conclusion

I start this conclusion by reminding the reader that any findings are inevitably and unavoidably partial, and are also messy, multi-dimensional and do not provide any simple answers. However, it is possible to put forward a response to the research question set out at the beginning of this thesis.

The response starts, as the thesis did, with a consideration of the term, ‘the arts’, and its meaning, or meanings in the context of state funding for ‘the arts’. In Chapter Two I argued that a very particular, historically contingent arts reality was in place, drawing on post-Kantian aesthetics, the Arnoldian view of culture and a very specific understanding of the role of the intellectual (and, as described in Chapter Three, a version which already had embedded within it an antithetical position towards measurement).

This particular view of the arts, combined with the individually powerful position held by Maynard Keynes, and a historically contingent set of creative practices (opera, ballet, orchestral music and fine art) came together with the political imperative to provide moral support during the second world war, in such a way that facilitated the initiation of state funding for ‘the arts’ in the UK. All of the individual elements were contingent, including the particular set of creative practices embedded into the definition, which have their own genealogies rooted in continental European high culture. Foucault’s eventalisation (Foucault, 1981, p.6), and its description of the importance of ‘a given moment’ in determining what can become considered self-evident, provided a helpful frame for

understanding how these different elements were able to combine into a new entity 'the arts', which became the basis by which the Arts Council was able to distinguish whether or not a particular creative practice met the criteria for funding. I also drew on Law's (2004) notion of romantic versus baroque to consider how separate, concrete and highly specific practices were brought together into a centred abstraction called 'the arts', one which both exists, in text and speech and policy documents, and also does not exist, in that there is never a physical manifestation of the entity 'the arts' (manifestations of creative practices are always given their specific name, never the abstraction).

This complexity underpinned the detailed empirical work of the thesis, starting with the early history of the Arts Council and the development of 'the arts' into an arts funding assemblage. The analytical process used drew heavily on Foucauldian archaeology, identifying the continuous series of Annual Reports and Accounts of the Arts Council as the key documentary source, able to provide an annual snapshot into both the stated position and the enacted funding decisions of that organisation. In Chapter Six I argued that 'the arts' became a more extended assemblage, bringing together the inscriptions already held within the term 'the arts' with a mechanism (the Arts Council) and a method (patronage) for state funding, and, through the process of development a set of new entities were brought into being, including the art-form as understood within the context of the assemblage, the art-form expert (both advisory panel members and executive staff of the Arts Council), and specialist professional art-form organisations. I worked through the detailed example of music as an art-form, demonstrating how, by 1964, the range of possibilities contained within the word

music had been limited to the very particular set of creative practices embedded in the term 'the arts', delivered by specific, named organisations, with several of those organisations coming into existence because of the availability of state funding, and others shaping themselves in response to that funding.

Here, there are striking similarities to Bourdieu's autonomous field (1986), however the model of the triple lock provided by Law et al (2011) is more helpful as it provides a way to understand how the assemblage holds together. For example, the inertia in relation to geography and the role of regional associations, as set out in Chapter Six, shows how, without experts, any focus on regional activity as an alternate to art-form development could not get a purchase. Although the triple lock was envisaged specifically in relation to research practices, I argue that the art-form experts take the place of researchers, in their role of defining what does and does not fit the art-form definition; the realities are the specific creative practices that both already exist and are developed through the assemblage; the institutions and networks include the funding mechanisms, the art form panels, and the organisational structure of the Arts Council. These elements work together to create a tightly bound set of conditions of possibility in relation to state funding for the arts.

The following three Chapters continue to work through the Annual Reports and Accounts to investigate the resilience of the lock, and demonstrating how it managed to navigate significant social, cultural and political change. Chapter Seven explored the process in action by looking at the way the emergence of community arts in the late 1960s and 1970s was managed, drawing on Law's fractional realities (Law, 2004a, p.74) to see both absorption and rejection

facilitated by the Baldry Report, which did not make explicit which community arts reality was in action, attempting to hold apart differential realities, one that would be acceptable to the Arts Council and one recognised by community arts practitioners. This enabled the assemblage to take in only those elements which worked within its existing boundaries. Community arts re-formatted as education was fashioned into a mechanism to encourage engagement with the particular set of creative practices ('the arts') already embedded within the assemblage. The collective creative practice, which Kelly argued sat at the heart of community arts, and which did not fit within the assemblage, was excluded. The response to the 1976 Race Relations Act followed a similar pattern. The report, co-commissioned by the Arts Council, *The Art Britain Ignores* (Khan, 1976), encompassed a sufficiently wide territory that again it was possible both to incorporate and exclude, with a very small amount of funding awarded to an external body to manage 'minority arts'.

Chapter Eight tracked the assemblage through a period in the 1980s and early 1990s which is commonly highlighted as one in which the basis for state funding of the arts changed considerably, driven by central government focus on new public management and the need to move from state intervention to earned income and private sponsorship. However, by investigating the detail of the Annual Report narratives it became clear that although the narrative descriptions changed with, for example, the developing emphasis on the percentage of earned income in comparison to state funding which starts to appear in graphic form, the enacted funding decisions continued with relatively little change. The development of data as advocacy became increasingly visible during this period,

chiming very much with the position outlined by Campbell et al in Chapter Four, with the use of the TGI data (which did not differentiate between funded and non-funded activities) in the graphics supporting the increased income generating capacity of the funded arts sector an early example of their free-floating data, detached from its origins.

Chapter Nine addressed the impact of the 1997 election of a New Labour government, and the setting up of a Department for Culture, Media and Sport. Again, it showed how the potentially very powerful tools presented by the Social Exclusion Unit and the Comprehensive Spending Review were effectively absorbed within the arts funding assemblage. The triple lock which came into place in the late 1940s had successfully navigated multiple changes in government, as well as significant social and cultural change.

The existence and resilience of the triple lock is a critical part of addressing the question of why the sector has faced such difficulties with measuring impact. As with the development of the triple lock, the answers I put forward are historically contingent, messy and do not neatly come together into an overarching narrative. The first challenge to measurement comes from within the intellectual tradition embedded in the definition of 'the arts', drawing on the discussion in Chapter Three which sets out the nature of aesthetics as antithetical to measurement: it is the case, as argued by many within the sector, that it is not possible to measure the particular reality of aesthetic experience. However, as also discussed in Chapter Three, that particular arts reality is only one of many possible versions, and others, rooted in more concrete and specific understandings of particular creative practices could be more amenable to

measurement, if it were possible to step outside the triple lock. The concrete and specific opens up the second challenge to measurement, again as discussed in Chapter Three, 'the arts' does not exist at the point at which people interact with creative practice, and unless measuring practices are in some way commensurate with the entity they are attempting to measure, following Desrosieres (1998), they cannot have the potential to be successful in their measurement.

The work carried out in Chapter Five identified a number of areas for investigation, starting with the categories used to define what counted as an arts engagement, and why there was a division into attendance and participation; then a consideration of geography and location, and the free-floating but specific nature of the physical spaces in which arts engagement was to take place; questions raised by the invisibility of both quality and funding within the survey, given their apparent importance in terms of the stated purpose of the surveys; and finally the role of the attitudinal questions, again given the stated purpose of the survey. Having now carried out the archaeological and genealogical work across Chapters Six to Nine, there is a very different set of lenses through which to view the questions posed by the analysis of the sample surveys. The initial analysis could not make any assumptions about the work taking place, and the relationship between that work and its historical context, it could only identify points of interest and provide starting points for the work that followed. It is here that the importance of working both with Foucauldian archaeology and genealogy and the STS concepts of assemblage and in particular the triple lock described by Law et al (2011) comes to the fore, as in combination they provide

a way of managing both the temporal and the spatial. Work takes place over time, as well as across the contemporary working surface, and it is only by working with a combination of the two that it becomes possible to construct a plausible narrative.

Starting with the Taking Part Survey, the survey reflects the stable arts funding assemblage described over Chapters Six to Nine, and first developed in the early years of the Arts Council. Viewing the question set as a manifestation of the assemblage provides a route to address the questions raised by the analysis in Chapter Five and outlined above.

By comparing the Taking Part Survey with the Omnibus Surveys from 1991, 2001, and 2003 it is clear that the question set itself had emerged over time, first appearing in 1991 in response to a quite different political agenda. The attitudinal questions, which were difficult to understand in the context of the stated purpose of the Taking Part Survey, had originally developed in response to a need for a combination of advocacy and marketing intelligence to support the activity of the Arts Council funded client organisations. This hinterland makes more sense of the question set than its apparent focus on providing the evidence to meet the needs of the PSA agreement. It also makes sense of one of the most visible uses of the data, as part of the development of an arts segmentation tool, Arts Audiences Insight, used specifically to support the marketing of arts activity, given that the initial driver for data collection was for marketing purposes, and the original question set was developed with that purpose in mind.

Looking in detail at the questions and starting with the categories of activity that counted as arts engagement, it is apparent that these too came forward from

the Omnibus Surveys and before them the questions in the Target Group Index survey, however that is not their starting point. The categories used in the surveys track back to the art-form categories which developed as part of the assemblage and were first included in the Omnibus Surveys to provide a combination of market research intelligence for Arts Council client organisations, and advocacy for the Arts Council.

As described above the Arts Council art-form categories manifested a tightly focused reality, with for example, music as an Arts Council art-form category, following the Artstat Digest, creating a reality in which the word music stood in for a core of orchestral music delivered by a small number of professional client organisations of the Arts Council, with at its edges a range of marginal project activity, in receipt of far lower levels of funding, on a project by project basis. At the same time, as illustrated by *Arts, Whats in a Word: Ethnic Minorities and the Arts* (Jermyn and Desai, 2000), the art-form categories generated as part of the Arts Council arts funding assemblage had taken hold well beyond their original territory and could also be implicated in the way that respondents understood the activities within the survey.

Turning next to the question of attendance versus participation, again this is not a neat story. There are multiple, interlocking actions taking place, and the exploration of those actions across this thesis has foregrounded the way in which different and potentially incompatible realities are to be found embedded within Taking Part.

My starting point was to see where attendance and participation appeared in the set of surveys which pre-dated Taking Part, with the division into attendance

and participation present in the Omnibus Surveys from 1991, the TGI survey questions entirely focused on attendance, and the Household Survey in 2002 only included participation, all of which suggest that the division was well established and understood as a core differential at least back to the start of the TGI survey questions. Looking at the difference between the TGI questions and 1991 Omnibus survey, the 1991 survey includes questions on participation as these were needed to provide a baseline for the National Media and Arts Strategy: as discussed in Chapter Seven, this strategy was never enacted, but the draft documentation indicates that it would have provided a significant challenge to the assemblage, with a clear move away from the patron/client/professional art-form model towards one which included professional, amateur and community arts, across a much wider definition of arts and cultural activity.

The participation questions therefore are bringing through a reality that was not fully enacted. The attendance questions have a more straightforward antecedence through the development of market research to support the ticket income generation of client organisations, tracking back through the Omnibus Surveys to the TGI questions.

The question as to why the Arts Council placed its primary focus on attendance rather than participation is visible in the development of the arts funding assemblage and the decisive move away from participation discussed in Chapter Six, in order to more fully support the professional client organisations in the late 1940s and early 1950s. As also discussed in Chapter Six, it links back to post-Kantian aesthetics and the idea of the primacy of the interaction between

the viewer and the art as the point at which the work of culture takes place. The focus on the point of interaction segues neatly into the question of geography and locality, and that free-floating but specific nature of the space in which that interaction was to take place.

The first question here is the absence of distribution through mass media, an area that was not included in the Taking Part Survey (other than the internet), but which was covered in the Omnibus Surveys. Again, the lost National Arts and Media Strategy is an important factor, as one of its primary functions was to bring together the different strands of publicly funded activity, in particular arts and broadcasting. The detail of the 1991 question set highlights a concern with the potential of radio, television and recorded media to disrupt or reduce attendances at live performances (see appendix seven, question 19 of the 1991 Survey), implying that the primary interest was not in understanding broadcast media as additional and beneficial, but more in understanding their possible threat to live performance. The drivers for the Taking Part survey were very different, with the arts questions in place to provide evidence of engagement in activities taking place as a result of government funding to the Arts Council.

This still leaves the question of the nature of the space in which arts engagement could take place, foregrounded by the way The Taking Part survey question set places the focus on attendance in particular physical spaces (have you been to...?), with some kinds of spaces specifically named (museums, galleries). The expectation that arts interactions take place in defined spaces is reinforced by the inclusion of street arts as a specific category, with an accompanying explanation: arts activities taking place outside identified,

bounded spaces cannot be absorbed into the art-form categories in which they might otherwise be expected to be counted. The expectation that the arts can only be experienced in specific localities draws on the notion of the professional art-form organisation, and the need for dedicated spaces in which they can operate. This is evidenced from the outset of the Arts Council, and visible throughout, for example by the Housing the Arts Strategy, or the initial focus of Arts Lottery Funding on capital projects. At the same time however, the specificity of location is entirely absent from the survey, so although engagement takes place in dedicated cultural spaces, no information is collected to help understand where those spaces are. This absence is one of a trio of absences, also including the absence of artistic quality, and the absence of funding from the surveys.

At the point of the development of the survey itself, the operational framework within which it came into being left very little room beyond a reflection of existing arts funding and management structures. So, although the survey provided a significant, robust and previously missing dataset, the shape of that data was inevitably determined by a whole series of previous policy decisions, with the definitions of the measurements taking place given shape by the publicly funded institutions. This only makes sense in relation to the originally stated purpose of the survey to measure engagement in publicly funded activity, but not in the relation to its subsequently stated aim of measuring cultural engagement more broadly.

The question as to why there is no clear way to establish the financial basis of the activities respondents took part in is also buried within this operational framework: the possibility that culturally relevant activity could be taking place

other than through public subsidy does not exist within the available conditions of possibility presented by the arts funding assemblage.

A further challenge is presented by the aggregation of the data when presented and used as high-level advocacy: as described above the sets of activities, and the way in which they are shaped means that the data being collected is neither amenable to aggregation nor comprehensive. To give an example, the experience of going to an art gallery is very different to that of going to a concert, however the high-level data pulls them into one statistic. Equally, the process of viewing a painting in an art gallery could be seen as very similar to viewing a painting in other settings, such as any other public or private building, but the experience of looking at a painting other than in a gallery is not counted. Following Law, the Taking Part question set can only produce data in relation to the realities embedded within the survey, and the messy overlap of different realities meant that the data coming out of the surveys was not able to answer questions in relation to the impact of state funding, because the role or otherwise of state funding even on the specific activities listed within the question set was neither fully embedded nor excluded. Therefore, the failure of the survey to demonstrate meaningfully significant shifts in responses as a result of funding decisions should not be surprising.

Turning now to the Active People Survey, as stated in the initial analysis, the detail held within the survey itself was very limited. Its impact came from its capacity to see at a geographic level not available to the Taking Part Survey, and how that information was used. The national indicators had a short-lived impact and did not see out the change to the Coalition Government in 2010. However,

the Arts Council used the Active People data set to define localities that were considered to have low arts engagement (local authorities in the bottom quintile for arts engagement according to the APS data) and those localities were therefore able to apply to the Creative People and Places (CPP) fund, with a total of twenty-one locations supported through the programme.

Data now emerging from that programme is starting to suggest that engagement in those localities in response to the CPP funded activity is very different to the very stable national data generated through the Taking Part Survey, which opens up a further area of research looking at the detail (the concrete and specific) of the CPP programmes to explore why they appear to have had a significant impact on engagement.

The Taking Part Survey is the detailed example explored in this thesis and is discussed at length in Chapter Five. Still, the overall principle could potentially be applied to other measurement practices relating to 'the arts'. This could open up alternative ways to conceptualise how the impact of engagement with concrete and specific creative practices could be measured and might address the challenges identified by Campbell et al (2017), detailed in Chapter Four.

In reaching these conclusions I also want to reflect on my choice of theoretical and methodological tools. The narrative they have produced is inevitably partial. Adopting a Gramscian approach to cultural policy studies (see for example McGuigan 1996), as discussed in Chapter Four, would potentially have produced a more politically engaged narrative, one which could explain the relationship between the particular historically contingent creative practices embedded within the arts funding assemblage and their role as social agents. This could pick up

more emphatically their connection to high social status in the UK at the time when the assemblage came into being. However, as stated in the introduction and again in Chapter Four, it was not my intention to engage with that particular question on the grounds that it offers little guidance on the challenge of measurement. The specificity of the creative practices embedded within the assemblage, and the trajectories by which they came to be there is an interesting topic in itself, but not the one I set out to consider.

In choosing to work with the combination of Foucauldian and ANT/STS approaches, I have demonstrated that McGuigan's view of governmentality should be rethought, not simply as a passive administrative tool, but as a powerful tool for conceptualising the way in which governing takes place, across the actions of individuals, and in processes, structures, institutions, including but by no means limited to the state itself. The particular combination of Foucauldian and ANT/STS has provided a useful set of tools for understanding not only how a particular reality came into being, but how it maintained itself over an extended period, in the face of significant social, political and cultural change. Conceptualising the development of an arts funding assemblage, held together by a triple lock provided a way to understand what to look for, and enabled me to draw on Foucault for the specificity of how and where to look, adopting a "grey, meticulous and patiently documentary" (Foucault, 1984, p.76) process to work through the detailed material provided by sixty years of Arts Council Annual Reports and Accounts.

Coda - where next?

As set out in the introduction, this coda is written in my professional voice, and addresses the impact working on this thesis has had, both on my professional understanding, and on my practical approach to developing a response to the challenge of measurement. Researching this doctorate has at every stage informed my professional work, and particularly my understanding of the role and place of evidence. The challenge of wanting to demonstrate whether and how cultural engagement in all its forms could have an impact, both positive and negative, on the major issues facing local authorities, was one of the reasons I started down this route.

I was initially very cynical about the Taking Part Survey and the turn to large scale sample surveys, but now have a much greater sympathy for the policy makers who decided to adopt the approach. The surveys did the best they could with the resources and knowledge available to them, and the structuring of the Taking Part Survey to suit the needs of marketing and audience development was very much a reflection of the context in which they were working. Rather than taking what I initially expected to be a turn away from quantitative data and towards a position that privileged qualitative research methods as better suited for the understanding of the impact of cultural activity, during my field work I came to a different recognition, that we needed quantitative data to help frame qualitative work, and that prior to Taking Part, the cultural sector had lacked anything that even resembled the taken for granted and often invisible

quantitative framing that underpins the language of qualitative social research. This does not invalidate the very real critique made of the Taking Part survey, and the challenge posed by the historically contingent triple lock which underpins the question set but does situate it as a valuable step within what I hope will be a much longer trajectory for the role of quantitative approaches to understanding cultural engagement. Following Desrosieres (1998), statistical reasoning can be critically informed, and can and should recognise and work with its performativity at the same time as generating useful data. However, given my own efforts to become familiar with the research process and the difficulties I faced in managing research alongside my professional work, I also recognised the significant and continuing challenge of expecting artists, arts practitioners and arts policy makers to reconstitute themselves as researchers.

Short term political cycles and the pressure to continually justify arts funding, combined with the undeniable complexity and expense of engaging in detailed research into the impact of arts engagement, and the challenge of a triple lock which had embedded within it an antithetical approach to measurement, appear to have led to a process of research mimicry, picking up and discarding different approaches as they came to attention and then subsequently failed to deliver. As a result, the sector has never fully settled on or committed to the historically high cost of the kinds of longitudinal research that might have been able to generate useable evidence of impact, with or without a theoretically and critically informed hinterland. The rhetoric that measurement would never be able to capture the essence of the arts, has been reinforced as multiple different impact measure approaches have failed to meet the basic criteria for sustainable knowledge

practices. Practitioners in the field, subject to an ever-changing kaleidoscope of measurement approaches, all of which required effort, developed a sense of distrust and almost disregard for the potential of data capture to generate meaningful knowledge about cultural engagement, reinforcing the position of the triple lock.

Today, the primary driver for data capture continues to be marketing, now seen through the language of audience development. There is a language and rhetoric associated with outcomes not matched by the reality, which is at best very patchy, with much data collected for little real gain. This is not true of all areas of cultural practice: arts practice within health, and within particular therapeutic practices, have a very different understanding of evidence, however they are not reflective of the wider subsidised sector. The commercial sector of course does not need to understand any impact other than financial and is already very good at collecting the relevant data.

However, there is room for optimism: because the subsidised arts sector is not yet wedded to a particular way of working, there is the potential to look at the opportunities provided by new methods of data capture, opportunities which would not necessarily require the practitioner to retrain as researcher. Unpicking the potential impacts of cultural engagement might be possible through the use of data capture technologies, akin to the fitness trackers fast becoming a ubiquitous part of everyday life. It will require attention from the sector, to raise awareness of the potential and the need. It will, as with every intervention, change the reality of what it is we are trying to understand, and it will be vital to take a critically informed position, recognising the performativity of the

measurement process itself. However, it has the potential be a more fruitful approach than simply continuing to claim the act and impact of cultural engagement as unfathomable mystery.

On a very practical level, this has now translated into a live project, currently supported by my employer Cambridge City Council, the Arts Council, and the Paul Hamlyn Foundation, working out from the existing library card technology for children and young people living in Cambridgeshire, to capture data on participations across a very broad set of cultural activities, linked in its first phase of development to educational outcomes data. The potential dataset is on a different scale to anything previously seen within the subsidised cultural sector, with over 19,000 young people already actively using a library card in Cambridgeshire. This project is currently in an early live testing phase, with a small cohort of children and young people recruited to take part in a pilot programme.

The opportunity to work on this thesis and explore both the history and the theoretical context for evidence and data collection in the arts has proved invaluable in helping to shape the project, particularly through the analysis of the Taking Part Survey and the lens provided by the imagining of the arts funding assemblage. Data collection will be person rather than organisationally centred: recognising that participation happens in a wide variety of ways, and understanding the positive or negative impact of cultural engagement on an individual means effectively capturing as much of that participation as possible, something which cannot be done either by an individual organisation (the route by which the majority of impact measurement is currently attempted), or through

sample surveys, which rely on individual memory, representational issues, and as described above on the specific 'arts' reality built into the question set. Recognising that it is not possible to remove that final point, one way to try and address the limitations it imposes is to collect as much data as possible, using a much broader definition of cultural engagement, so that there is at least the potential for researchers, rather than simply being pulled into one already constructed reality, to use the data to imagine and test multiple arts realities.

11. Appendices

Appendix One:	The Royal Charters
Appendix Two:	Analysis of the Taking Part Survey
Appendix Three:	Analysis of the Art Form Music (1945-64)
Appendix Four:	Arts Council Annual Reports and Accounts
Appendix Five:	Extract from the Glory of the Garden
Appendix Six:	Extract from the Comprehensive Spending Review 1998
Appendix Seven:	The Omnibus Survey Question Sets

Appendix One: The Royal Charters

Extract from the 1946 Royal Charter

“WHEREAS is has been represented to Us by Our Chancellor of the Exchequer that for the purpose of developing a greater knowledge, understanding and practice of the fine arts exclusively, and in particular to increase the accessibility of the fine arts to the public throughout Our Realm, to improve the standard of execution of the fine arts and to advise and co-operate with Our Government Departments, local authorities and other bodies on any matters concerned directly or indirectly with those objects, and with a view to facilitating the holding of and dealing with any money provided by Parliament and any other property, real or personal, otherwise available for those objects, it is expedient that the unincorporated Institution formerly known as the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts and now known as the Arts Council of Great Britain should be created a Body Corporate under the name of the Arts Council of Great Britain...”

Extract from the 1967 Royal Charter

“3. The objects for which the Council are established and incorporated are as follows:

(A) to develop and improve the knowledge, understanding and practice of the arts;

(B) to increase the accessibility of the arts to the public throughout Great

Britain; and

(C) to advise and co-operate with Departments of Our Government, local authorities and other bodies on any matters concerned whether directly or indirectly with the foregoing objects.”

Appendix Two: Analysis of the Taking Part Survey

This analysis works through the 2014-15 question set in detail, and highlights points picked up in the main text.

The print-out version of question set covers 225 pages and is used by the interviewer as the basis for the face to face interview with the respondent.

The first three sections (20 pages) are devoted to demographic data and checking that the person answering the questions is the expected respondent.

The fourth section asks about subjective well-being:

“How satisfied are you with your life nowadays?”, “Overall, to what extent do you feel that the things you do in your life are worthwhile?” and “Overall, how anxious did you feel yesterday?” (p.22 2014-15 Taking Part Survey).

The fifth section asks about activities the respondent undertook when growing up. In the main text this starts up the discussion as to what is inscribed within the available categories(p.85). The text read out to respondents was:

“Now I would like to ask you a few questions about activities you may have done when you were growing up. By ‘growing up’ I mean when you were aged around 11 and 15. I’ll go on to ask you about what you do now later in the interview.” (p.23 ibid).

“When you were growing up, did you do any of the following...?”

- 1. Go to museums or art galleries*
- 2. Go to theatre or to see a dance or classical music performances*
- 3. Go to historic sites (this includes historic attractions such as old buildings, historic parks and gardens and archaeological sites)*

4. *Go to the library*

5. *None of these things*

-1. *Don't know* (p.23 ibid)

There is then a short series of questions relating to their answer (if they answer yes to more than one, then an activity is selected at random for the follow-on questions), asking how often they did the activity, and then with whom they did the activity.

The second series of questions in this section starts with:

"When you were growing up, did you do any of the following:

1. *Read books for pleasure/enjoyment (not required for school or religious studies)*

2. *Draw or paint*

3. *Write stories, poems, plays or music*

4. *Play musical instrument(s), act, dance or sing*

5. *Play video/computer games on a digital device like a console, a computer, a tablet or a mobile phone (this response was added in YR10)*

6. *None of these things*

-1. *Don't know"*

(p25 ibid)

Again, the follow-on questions ask how often the activity was undertaken, and with whom it was done.

The 'with whom it was done' options for both attendance and participation sections are:

1. *Alone*
2. *Youth Club*
3. *Scouts, Guides or other similar organisations*
4. *Parent/carer or other relative*
5. *After school club*
6. *Friends*
7. *Holiday club/scheme*
8. *School, including school trip(s)*
9. *Someone else*
- 1. *Don't know*

The importance of this question is more about what is not present than what is. The presence of Scouts/Guides as the only named institutions reflects a particular understanding of the kinds of organisation that could engage children and young people in cultural activity, as does the absence of any other faith based or community groups.

3.4 Taking Part as an Adult

The questionnaire then moves on to ask about activities as an adult. In the main text this is used to build on the discussion of what counts as cultural engagement (p.86).

3.4.1 Free Time Activities

The sixth section, titled Screeners and Frequencies, starts with a short sub section (6.1) about free-time activities:

"I would now like you to think about things that you do nowadays.

Please look at this list and tell me the number next to each of the things you do in your free time.

- 1. Spend time with friends/family*
- 2. Read*
- 3. Listen to music*
- 4. Watch TV*
- 5. Days out or visits to places*
- 6. Eat out at restaurants*
- 7. Go to pubs/bars/clubs*
- 8. DIY*
- 9. Gardening*
- 10. Shopping*
- 11. Sport/exercise*
- 12. Arts and crafts*
- 13. Play a musical instrument*
- 14. Go to cinema*
- 15. Visit museums/galleries*
- 16. Theatre/music concerts*
- 17. Play video/computer games on a digital device like a console, a computer,
a tablet or a mobile phone*
- 18. Internet/emailing*
- 19. Visits to historic sites*

20. *Other 1 (specify)*

21. *Other 2 (specify)*

22. *Other 3 (specify)*

23. *None of these*

(p 28 *ibid*).

The next sub-section, 6.2 is titled *Section A – Arts, Libraries, Archives, Museums and Heritage*, and focuses on activity within the last twelve months. This is picked up in the main text from p.86 onwards, with a further discussion of the detail of categories contained within the survey questions.

The first sub section asks about arts participation. The interviewer asks the respondent: “*In the last 12 months, have you done any of these activities?*” (SCARTP21)

1. *Ballet*

2. *Other dance (for fitness)*

3. *Other dance (not for fitness)*

4. *Sang to an audience or rehearsed for a performance (not karaoke)*

5. *Played a musical instrument to an audience or rehearsed for a performance*

6. *Played a musical instrument for your own pleasure*

7. *Written music*

8. *Rehearsed or performed in a play/drama*

9. *Rehearsed or performed in an opera/opera or musical theatre*

10. *Taken part in a carnival (eg. as a musician, dancer or costume maker)*
11. *Taken part in street arts (an artistic performance that takes place in everyday surroundings like parks, streets or shopping centres)*
12. *Learned or practiced circus skills*
13. *Painting, drawing, printmaking or sculpture*
14. *Photography as an artistic activity (not family or holiday 'snaps')*
15. *Made films or videos as an artistic activity (not family or holidays)*
16. *Used a computer to create original artworks or animation*
17. *Textile crafts such as embroidery, crocheting or knitting*
18. *Wood crafts such as wood turning, carving or furniture making*
19. *Other crafts such as calligraphy, pottery or jewellery for yourself*
20. *Bought any original works of art for yourself*
21. *Bought any original/handmade crafts such as pottery or jewellery for yourself*
22. *Read for pleasure (not newspapers, magazines or comics)*
23. *Bought a novel or book of stories, poetry or plays for yourself*
24. *Written any stories or plays*
25. *Written any poetry*
26. *Created a video or computer game*
27. *None of these*

(p.31-32 *ibid*, the list order is randomized, but with codes 1-3 and 17-19 kept together).

The follow up questions asks firstly about whether the activity (ies) were done

1. *In your own time*
2. *For paid work*
3. *For academic study*
4. *As part of voluntary work*
5. *For some other reason*

-1. *Don't know*

(p.32 *ibid*)

Then about frequency:

1. *At least once a week*
2. *Less often than once a week but at least once a month*
3. *Less often than once a month but at least 3 or 4 times a year*
4. *Twice in the last 12 months*
5. *Once in the last 12 months*

-1. *Don't know*

(p.32-33 *ibid*)

The next question is asked of people taking part in at least one activity, either in their own time, or as part of voluntary work

“Did you do any of these activities as part of a club or group? These could formally organized clubs or just groups of people who get together to do an activity or talk about things.” (p.33 *ibid*).

The final question in this sub-section is asked of people who say that they

read for pleasure, in their own time, or as part of voluntary work, and asked:

“How often do you read for pleasure as part of a club or group?” (p.33 *ibid*),
with the same frequency options as above.

The second sub-section asks about arts attendance, with the first question as follows:

“In the last 12 months, have you been to any of these events?”

(SCAAN)

- 1. Film at a cinema or other venue*
- 2. Exhibition or collection of art, photography or sculpture*
- 3. Craft exhibition (not crafts market)*
- 4. Event which included video or electronic art*
- 5. Event connected with books or writing*
- 6. Street arts (art in everyday surroundings like parks, streets or shopping centres)*
- 7. A public art display or installation (an art work such as sculpture that is outdoors or in a public place)*
- 8. Circus (not animals)*
- 9. Carnival*
- 10. Culturally specific festival (for example Mela, Baisakhi, Navrati)*
- 11. Play/drama*
- 12. Pantomime*
- 13. Musical*

14. Opera/operetta

15. Classical music performance

16. Jazz performance

17. Other live music event

18. Ballet

19. Contemporary dance

20. African's people's dance or South Asian and Chinese Dance

21. other live dance event

22. None of these

(p.43-35 ibid)

(List order randomized but codes 14-17 and 18-21 kept together)

Follow up questions again asked firstly about whether the activity (ies) were done:

1. In your own time

2. For paid work

3. For academic study

4. As part of voluntary work

5. For some other reason

-1. Don't know (p.35 ibid)

Then about frequency:

1. At least once a week

2. Less often than once a week but at least once a month

3. *Less often than once a month but at least 3 or 4 times a year*

4. *Twice in the last 12 months*

5. *Once in the last 12 months*

-1. *Don't know* (p.35 *ibid*)

The final set of questions in this sub section expanded on the response to 17.

Other live music. This is discussed in the main text on p.89. Respondents who said that they had attended other live music either in their own time or as part of voluntary work, were then asked:

"Can you tell me what sort of music you have been to see?"

1. *Rock music*

2. *Soul, R&B or hip-hop music*

3. *Folk or country and western music*

4. *Reggae/Calypso/Caribbean music*

5. *African music*

6. *South Asian music*

7. *Spanish or Latin American music*

8. *Other (specify)*

-1. *Don't know* (p.36 *ibid*)

'And in what kinds of venue have you watched this music?'

1. *Pub/bar*

2. *Hotel*

3. *Restaurant/café*

4. *Small club*
5. *Medium to large live music venue*
6. *Clubs and associations (private)*
7. *Student Union*
8. *Church halls/community centres*
9. *Park/Field*
10. *Other (specify)*
- 1. *Don't know (p36-37 ibid)*

The next two sub-sections cover libraries, archives, and heritage and although interesting in themselves, are not specifically relevant here. The next sub-section I pick up is 6.2.6 Museums and Galleries, which is discussed in the main text on p.90.

The first question is:

“During the last 12 months, have you attended a museum or gallery at least once”

1. *Yes*
2. *No*

-1. *Don't know (p.45 ibid)*

If yes, then

“In the last 12 months, have you attended a museum or gallery...”

1. *In your own time*
2. *For paid work*

3. *For academic study*
4. *As part of voluntary work*
5. *For some other reason*

-1. *Don't know* (p.45-46 *ibid*)

And

How often in the last 12 months have you been to a museum or gallery in your own time or as part of voluntary work?

1. *At least once a week*
2. *Less often than once a week but at least once a month*
3. *Less often than once a month but at least 3 or 4 times a year*
4. *Twice in the last 12 months*
5. *Once in the last 12 months*

-1. *Don't know* (p.46 *ibid*)

The final question asks:

"Thinking about these your museum or gallery visits over the last 12 months, where did they take place? Please choose your answer from this list, and choose as many as apply:

1. *England*
2. *Scotland*
3. *Wales*
4. *Northern Ireland*
5. *Republic of Ireland*

6. *Europe*

7. *Outside Europe*

8. *Don't know* (p.46-47 *ibid*).

(Question added in Y7 Q2, July 2011).

The next section relevant to this thesis occurs in section 7, Detail of Participation (Levers), and is discussed on p.91 of the main text. Sub-section 7.1 picks up Participation in Arts Activities, and returns to the answers to SCARTP21, (*"in the last 12 months, have you done any of these activities?"*).

It focuses about one activity (randomly selected when there is more than one to choose from, activities 6, 20, 21, and 23 are excluded).

The following initial questions are asked:

- *"On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being awful and 10 being brilliant, how much did you enjoy it?"* (p.75 *ibid*)
- *"How likely that you will [present tense verb + activity] again?"* (p.76 *ibid*)
- *"Have you recommended [present tense verb + activity] to a friend or family member?"* (p.76 *ibid*)

It then moves on to asks about opinions about the arts, using a standard five point scale (1. Strongly agree, 2, agree, 3. Neither agree nor disagree, 4. Disagree, 5. Strongly disagree, -1. Don't know), in relation to the following statements:

- a. *The arts make a difference to where I live*
- b. *The arts are not really for people like me*

- c. *There are lots of opportunities to get involved in the arts if I want*
- d. *Government funding enables a wide range of people to experience the arts*
- e. *Government funding for the arts doesn't really benefit me (p.77 ibid)*

Sub-section 7.2 (p.78) asks about levers relating to arts attendance, again asking about one randomly selected activity:

"I would like to ask you some more detail about the last time you went to [+SCAAN+] [in your own time] [or] [as part of voluntary work]

"What kind of venue was the event held in?"

- 1. *Medium to large arts or music venue*
- 2. *Small arts or music venue*
- 3. *Town or village hall*
- 4. *Church or other religious centre*
- 5. *Community centre*
- 6. *On a university campus*
- 7. *Outdoors, for example in a park*
- 8. *Club, bar, hotel or restaurant*
- 9. *Other (specify)*
- 1. *Don't know (p.78 ibid)*

With the follow up questions:

"On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being awful and 10 being brilliant, how much did you enjoy it?"

How likely is it that you will [present tense verb + activity] again?

Have you recommended [present tense verb + activity] to a friend or family member? (p79-80 ibid).

Sub-section 7.3 asks similar questions in relation to libraries, 7.4, in relation to archives, was removed in April 2012.

Sub-section 7.5 asks similar questions in relation to museums and galleries

“On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being awful and 10 being brilliant, how much did you enjoy it?”

How likely is it that you will go to a museum/gallery again?

Have you recommended [+INSERT FROM MUSNAM+] to a friend or family member?.

Sub-section 7.6 asks similar questions in relation to heritage, and 7.7 in relation to sports.

Sub-section 8.1 Participating in Arts Activities is a set of questions to be asked people who stated earlier that they have not participated in the sector in the last 12 months.

The first question uses the same list as SCARTP21 and asks if the respondent has ever done any of the activities. The follow up question asks:

“Thinking about the time when you used to take part in these activities. Which, if any, did you do at least once a month? (P.94 ibid)

Sub section 8.2, Attendance at Arts Events uses the almost same list as SCAAN and is only asked if SCAAN = 22 or 1 only, or if SCAAN = 2-21 AND APWKAC <1 OR APWKAC <4. The only difference is that 1. Film is excluded

from the list.

The follow up question asks:

“Thinking about the time when you used to go to these events. Which, if any, did you go to at least three or four times a year?” (p.95 *ibid*)

The final question in this section is the opinions about the arts question as described above.

Sub-section 8.5 Visiting Museum or Galleries asks if the respondent has ever been to a museum or gallery, and whether they ever visited at least one or two times a year.

The short section ‘Life Events’ asks

“about things that may have happened in your life since your last interview. We’re interested in these kinds of events as they may affect your participation in activities.” (p.104 *ibid*).

Sub-sections 10.1 Arts Participation, and 10.2 Arts attendance, use information from this and previous interviews to highlight changes in behaviour and asks why.

Suggested responses for increased levels of activity:

I have less childcare responsibility/children are less dependent

I have more free time

I get on well with the people who do it

My friends started doing it/doing more of it

I wanted to meet new people

I enjoy doing the activity with other people/socializing through the activity

*I wanted to introduce my child to a new activity/encourage my child's interests
or learning*

I'm passionate about it

I wanted a new challenge

I wanted to broaden my interests

I wanted to do something for myself

My health improved

I can afford to do it now

The facilities have improved

Facilities have become available close to where I live

Other reason (p.106-7 ibid)

Suggested responses for reduced levels of activity:

I had less free time

Childcare responsibilities took priority over it

There were other things I preferred to do in my leisure time

I didn't get on with the people who did it

Everyone I used to do it with had given it up

I stopped enjoying or didn't enjoy the activity

It was/became too difficult

I felt out of place

Once I stopped doing it, it was easier not to do it again

I developed health problems or a disability

I didn't feel I was good enough

Once I was out of practice, it was too hard to get back into it

It became too expensive

It changed to an inconvenient time

It was difficult to get to via the transport options available to me

The facilities got worse

The venue closed down

I had trouble accessing the place where it was held

Other reason (p.108-9 ibid)

Factors affecting participation is a new section from April 2012 for the longitudinal sample only, discussed in the main text on p.93.

This section starts with questions about normal daily activities, asking

"During the past 12 months, to what extent has your physical health interfered with your normal daily activities with family, friends, neighbours or groups?" and

"During the last 12 months how much did physical pain interfere with your normal daily activities?" (p.137 ibid).

The next set of questions focus on perception, stating

"I am going to read out a number of statements and for each one, I would like you to tell me to what extent it is true for you".

"You would feel a real loss if you were forced to give up:

- a. Attending arts events in the future*
- b. Taking part in arts activities in the future*

- c. *Visiting museums and galleries in the future*
- d. *Visiting heritage sites in the future*
- e. *Using library services in the future*
- f. *Taking part in sport in the future*
- g. *Playing video or computer games (p.138 ibid)*

“You would feel completely confident and at ease...

- a. *At arts events such as musicals, plays, dance events or musical performances*
- b. *At art, photography or craft exhibitions*
- c. *In museums and galleries*
- d. *At heritage sites*
- e. *In libraries*
- f. *In situations where people take part in sport or exercise activity*
- g. *About the appearance of your body when taking part in sport or exercise activity*

“there are some opinions that people have expressed about different types activities (sic). Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with each statement on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means strongly agree and 5 means strongly disagree.

- a. *I am an arty person*
- b. *Having access to museums and galleries in my local area is important to me*

- c. *Museums play an important role in helping me understand the world*
- d. *I'm interested in the history of the places where I live*
- e. *Conservation of local heritage really benefits me*
- f. *I am a sporty person"*

Section 12 – Internet Use

This section looks at internet use in relation to the range of DCMS sectors.

Questions within this section start with:

May I ask, in the last 12 months, have you used the internet to look at any of the following websites?

- 1. Museum/gallery websites*
- 2. Library websites*
- 3. Historical or heritage websites*
- 4. Arts websites (including music, theatre, dance, visual arts and literature)*
- 5. Archive/record office websites*
- 6. Sport websites*
- 7. None of these*

[Question removed from questionnaire in Y4 Q4 (April 2009), added back in for Y6 Q1 (April 2010)

Response list amended in Y7Q2 (July 2011)]

If the respondent answers positively to one or more of these, there are a series of follow up questions to establish the purpose of visiting the website/s.

The following is the question specifically in relation to an arts website:

You said that you had been on an arts website. Was this to...?

- 1. View or download part or all of a performance or exhibition*
- 2. Find out more about an artist/performer or event*
- 3. Discuss the arts or share art that others have created*
- 4. Upload or share art that you have created yourself*
- 5. Buy tickets for an arts performance or exhibition*
- 6. Find out how to take part or improve your creative skills, such as through lessons or clubs*
- 7. Some other reason (**PLEASE SPECIFY**)*

-1. Don't know

['Other' changed to be 'please specify' in Y6 Q1 (April 2010)

Question removed from questionnaire in Y4 Q4 (April 2009), added back in for Y6 Q1 (April 2010)

Question amended in Y7Q1 (July 2011)]

Here, internet use sits entirely separately to the earlier section on arts engagement: the question on arts websites does not mention art-forms, or separate out participation versus attendance.

Section 14, Charitable giving, was added Y6 Q4, January 2011, and reflects the changed policy imperatives of the Coalition government. As with the section on the internet, the arts are described much more simply than in the earlier sections. The question asking about the different sectors to which the respondent might have given charitable donations has two relevant categories: 'museums and/or galleries', and 'the arts'. Although these are much broader, they do

continue to reflect the structures behind the initial survey: the Museums and Galleries Commission, and Arts Council of England, even though the point at which the question was included long after the Museums and Galleries Commission had been subsumed, firstly into the MLA, and latterly into the Arts Council itself.

Two questions within this section are pertinent here:

“Here are some things that people have said about giving money to charities in the arts, culture and sporting sectors. Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with each statement on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means strongly agree and 5 means strongly disagree. Please just give me the number from the card.

- a. The arts and cultural sector is a worthy cause to give money to*
- b. It’s fair to pay an entry fee to public museums and galleries*
- c. Giving money to charities in the arts, culture and sporting sectors will make a difference to the facilities available to me*
- d. I would be prepared to pay a small top-up fee on top of an entry fee if that money went towards the upkeep of the attraction or organisation I was visiting*
- e. I would be happy to donate money to arts, cultural or sporting organisations that are local to me in order to keep them running*

[Question added in Y6 Q4 (January 2011), statement (c) amended in Y7Q2.

From Y8 Q1 (April 2012) asked of cross-sectional sample only.]”

and

“Here are some things that people have said might encourage them to donate

money to the arts, cultural or sporting sectors.

Please tell me how much they would encourage you to give money/more money to these sectors by giving me an answer from the card.

- a. Having more information about the different arts, cultural and sporting charities that I could support*
- b. Receiving letter/email of thanks from the charity*
- c. Receiving information from the charity or organisation explaining what has been done with my donation*
- d. Confidence that the arts, cultural or sporting charity uses the money efficiently*
- e. Being able to give money by tax efficient methods (e.g. gift-aid, payroll giving)*
- f. More generous tax relief (e.g. income tax relief on gifts made to charities)*
- g. Being asked by a friend or family member*
- h. Knowing the money will be spent/used locally*

Would this...

- 1. Encourage you a lot*
- 2. Encourage you a little*
- 3. Not at all*

[Question added in Y6 Q4 (January 2011), question text amended in Y7Q2. From Y8 Q1 (April 2012) asked of cross-sectional sample – SAMPLE A1 only.]”

These questions were added at a point at which the Coalition Government

was looking to increase significantly charitable giving to the DCMS sectors, and the detail focuses entirely on the mechanisms of giving. The interest here is the way in which the operation of the survey has been adapted to meet the needs of a very different administration, whilst keeping the other elements of the survey more or less intact.

Appendix Three: Analysis of the Art Form Music (1945-1964)

The first part of this appendix lists the account headings used annually from 1946 through to 1964. The headings are taken from the main accounts only until 1952, when the grants and guarantees are moved into a separate schedule. The grants and guarantee schedule from 1953 onwards is shown after the main headings to 1964.

The second part of this appendix is a narrative account of the changes in the level of funding awarded to different headings.

Account headings – main accounts

1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
MUSIC				
	MUSIC AND OPERA	MUSIC AND OPERA	MUSIC AND OPERA	
				OPERA AND BALLET
GRANTS	GRANTS			
		Grants and guarantees	Grants and guarantees	Grants and guarantees
	Covent Garden	Covent Garden	Covent Garden	Covent Garden
		Sadlers Wells	Sadlers Wells	Sadlers Wells Foundation
		Glyndebourne	<i>Glyndebourne</i>	
			English Opera Group,	English Opera Group, Ltd
				Miscellaneous grants and guarantees
National Council of music for Wales	National Council of Music for Wales			
English Folk Song and Dance Society	English Folk Song and Dance Society			
	Rural Music Schools			
Musicians Union	Musicians Union			
Manchester Tuesday Mid-day concerts	Manchester Tuesday Mid-day concerts			
Rural Music Schools Council				
				MUSIC
Guarantees	GUARANTEES			
				GRANTS AND
String orchestras				
	String Orchestras and			
Symphony Orchestras	Symphony Orchestras	Symphony Orchestras	Symphony Orchestras	Symphony Orchestras
Music Clubs	Music Clubs			
		Chamber and String	Chamber and String	Chamber and String
Miscellaneous	Miscellaneous guarantees			
		String Quartets	String Quartets	String Quartets
		Miscellaneous grants and guarantees	Miscellaneous grants and guarantees	Miscellaneous grants and guarantees
Directly Provided Concerts	DIRECTLY PROVIDED CONCERTS	DIRECTLY PROVIDED CONCERTS	DIRECTLY PROVIDED CONCERTS	DIRECTLY PROVIDED CONCERTS
Regional	Regional	Regional		
Factories and Hostel	Factories and hostels			
	GENERAL		GENERAL	GENERAL
		industrial music clubs	industrial music clubs	industrial music clubs
		Hostels and factories	Hostels and factories	
				Wigmore Concert Hall
		Ballet Rambert	Ballet Rambert	
Performing Right	Performing Right Society	Performing Right Society	Performing Right Society	Performing Right Society
Piano Hire and Piano depreciation				
Music department	Music department salaries	Music department salaries	Music department	Music department salaries
Regional organisers (apportionment)	Regional organisers (apportionment)	Regional Organisers (apportionment)	Regional Organisation (apportionment)	Regional Organisation (apportionment)

1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
OPERA AND BALLET	OPERA AND BALLET	OPERA AND BALLET	OPERA AND BALLET	OPERA AND BALLET
Grants and guarantees	Grants and Guarantees	Grants and guarantees	Grants and guarantees <i>detail in schedule 5</i>	Grants and guarantees <i>detail in schedule 5</i>
				Carla Rosa Trust Limited
Covent Garden Sadlers Wells	Covent Garden Sadler's Wells Foundation	Covent Garden Sadlers Wells		
English Opera Group, Miscellaneous grants and guarantees	English Opera Group, Ltd Miscellaneous grants and guarantees	English Opera Group, Miscellaneous grants and guarantees		
MUSIC	MUSIC	MUSIC	MUSIC	MUSIC
GRANTS AND	GRANTS AND	GRANTS AND	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 5</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 5</i>
Symphony Orchestras	Symphony Orchestras	Symphony Orchestras		
Chamber and String	Chamber and String	Chamber and String		
String Quartets Miscellaneous grants and guarantees	String Quartets Miscellaneous grants and guarantees	String Quartets Miscellaneous grants and guarantees		
DIRECTLY PROVIDED CONCERTS	DIRECTLY PROVIDED CONCERTS	DIRECTLY PROVIDED CONCERTS	Directly provided concerts	Directly provided concerts
GENERAL industrial music clubs	GENERAL industrial music clubs	GENERAL industrial music clubs		
Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall
Performing Right Society	Performing Right Society	Performing Right Society		
Music department	Music department salaries		<i>overheads move into</i>	
Regional Organisation (apportionment)	Regional Organisation (apportionment)	Regional Organisation (apportionment)		

1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
MUSIC	MUSIC	MUSIC	MUSIC	MUSIC
Opera and Ballet	Opera and Ballet	Opera and Ballet	Opera and Ballet	Opera and Ballet
Grants and guarantees <i>detail in schedule 5</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 5</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>
	directly provided concerts	directly provided concerts	directly provided	
				Directly Managed Performances (Opera for All)
Carla Rosa Trust Limited				
Other Activities	Other activities	Other activities	Other activities	Other activities
Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 5</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 5</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>
Directly Provided Concerts	Directly Provided Concerts	Directly Provided Concerts	Directly Provided Concerts	Directly Provided Concerts
Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall

1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
MUSIC	MUSIC	MUSIC	MUSIC	MUSIC
Opera and Ballet	Opera and Ballet	Opera and Ballet	Opera and Ballet	Opera and Ballet
Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>
Directly Managed Performances (Opera for All)	Directly Managed Performances (Opera for All)	Directly Managed Performances (Opera for All)	Directly Managed Performances (Opera for All)	Directly Managed Performances (Opera for All)
Directly provided				
Other activities	Other activities	Other activities	Other activities	Other activities
Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>	Grants and Guarantees <i>detail in schedule 3</i>
Directly Provided Concerts	Directly Provided Concerts			
Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall	Wigmore Concert Hall

Account headings – schedules

1953 (schedule 5)	1954 (schedule 5)	1955 (schedule 5)	1956 (schedule 5)	1957 (schedule 3)	1958 (schedule 3)
OPERA AND BALLET Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	OPERA AND BALLET Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	MUSIC Opera and Ballet Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	MUSIC Opera and Ballet Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	MUSIC Opera and Ballet Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	MUSIC Opera and Ballet Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited
			Sadler's Wells Trust Limited	Sadler's Wells Trust Limited The Royal Ballet School	Sadler's Wells Trust Limited The Royal Ballet School
Welsh National Opera Intimate Opera Society English Opera Group	Intimate Opera Society English Opera Group Carl Rosa Trust Limited	Intimate Opera Society English Opera Group Carl Rosa Trust Limited	Intimate Opera Society English Opera Group Carl Rosa Trust Limited	Intimate Opera Society Limited English Opera Group Limited	Intimate Opera Society Limited English Opera Group Limited Carl Rosa Trust Limited
Opera Studio Mercury Theatre Trust Limited (Ballet Rambert) Dellius Trust (For production of Imelin)		Mercury Theatre Trust Limited (Ballet Rambert)	Mercury Theatre Trust Limited (Ballet Rambert)	Mercury Theatre Trust Limited (Ballet Rambert)	Mercury Theatre Trust Limited (Ballet Rambert)
					Western Theatre Ballet Limited New Opera Company Limited
			The Welsh National Opera Company Limited	The Welsh National Opera Company Limited (London Season)	
MUSIC	MUSIC	Other Activities	Other Activities	other Activities	other Activities
London Philharmonic Orchestra	London Philharmonic Orchestra	London Philharmonic Orchestra	London Philharmonic Orchestra	London Philharmonic Orchestra Limited	London Philharmonic Orchestra Limited
Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra Halle Concerts Society	Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra Halle Concerts Society	Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra Halle Concerts Society	Liverpool Philharmonic Society Limited City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra Halle Concerts Society	Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Society Limited City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra Halle Concerts Society Western Orchestral Society Limited (Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra)	Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Society Limited City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra Halle Concerts Society Western Orchestral Society Limited (Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra)
London Symphony Orchestra	London Symphony Orchestra	London Symphony Orchestra Western Orchestral Society Limited (Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra)	London Symphony Orchestra	London Symphony Orchestra	London Symphony Orchestra
Payments to Music Societies and Clubs affiliated to the National Federation of Music Societies in respect of guarantees	Payments to Music Societies and Clubs affiliated to the National Federation of Music Societies in respect of guarantees	Payments to Music Societies and Clubs affiliated to the National Federation of Music Societies in respect of guarantees (including Federation administration)	Payments to Music Societies and Clubs affiliated to the National Federation of Music Societies in respect of guarantees	Payments to Music Societies and Clubs affiliated to the National Federation of Music Societies in respect of guarantees (including Federation administration)	Payments to Music Societies and Clubs affiliated to the National Federation of Music Societies in respect of guarantees (including Federation administration)
Jacques Orchestra Jacques Orchestra (For tour of Lake District) Boyd Neel Concert Society	Jacques Orchestra Boyd Neel Concert Society	Jacques Orchestra Boyd Neel Concert Society	Jacques Orchestra Boyd Neel Concert Society	Jacques Orchestra Boyd Neel Concert Society	Jacques Orchestra Boyd Neel Concert Society
	The Haydn-Mozart Society The Haydn Orchestra	The Haydn-Mozart Society			
Peter Gibbs String Quartet Rural Music Schools Association	Peter Gibbs String Quartet Rural Music Schools Association Institute of Contemporary Arts (Music Section)	Rural Music Schools Association Institute of Contemporary Arts (Music Section)	Rural Music Schools Association Institute of Contemporary Arts (Music Section)	Rural Music Schools Association Institute of Contemporary Arts (Music Section)	Rural Music Schools Association Institute of Contemporary Arts (Music Section)
London Contemporary Music Centre Society for the Promotion of New Music Western Philharmonic Society	Society for the Promotion of New Music Western Symphony Concerts Committee	Society for the Promotion of New Music	Society for the Promotion of New Music	Society for the Promotion of New Music	Society for the Promotion of New Music
			Western Orchestral Society Limited (Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra)		
Royal Philharmonic Society	Royal Philharmonic Society	Royal Philharmonic Society	Royal Philharmonic Society Limited	Royal Philharmonic Society Limited	Royal Philharmonic Society Limited
Brighton Philharmonic Society	Brighton Philharmonic Society	Brighton Philharmonic Society	Brighton Philharmonic Society Limited	Brighton Philharmonic Society Limited	Brighton Philharmonic Society Limited
English Folk Fance and Song Society Central Music Library	Central Music Library Lemare Concert Society	Central Music Library Lemare Concert Society Western Symphony Concerts Committee	Central Music Library Limited	Central Music Library Limited	Central Music Library Limited
		Ipswich Civic Concerts Society South-West Essex Music Club Newbury String Players Southern Orchestral Concert Society			
Direct Grants and Guarantees to Music Clubs for Concerts	Direct Grants and Guarantees to Musical Organisations for special Concert Activities	Direct Grants and Guarantees to other Musical Organisations for Concert Activities	Direct Grants and Guarantees to Musical Organisations for special Concert Activities	Direct Grants and Guarantees to Musical Organisations for special Concert Activities	Direct Grants and Guarantees to Musical Organisations for special Concert
Coronation Commissions					

Narrative description

The following description picks up the headings listed above and considers both changes to the headings, and to the amounts awarded under each heading.

1945

The account heading music has the sub-headings of grants, guarantees and directly provided concerts. It lists grants to the National Council of Music for Wales, English Folk Song and Dance Society, the Musicians Union, and the Manchester Tuesday Mid-day concerts; Guarantees to string orchestras, symphony orchestras, Music Clubs, and miscellaneous; and under directly provided concerts to sub headings of regional, and factories and hostels. It also lists its direct costs, including the Performing Rights Society, piano hire and auditions, piano depreciation, music department salaries and regional organisers. Of all the sub-headings, the factories and hostels category received the most funds, at £40,772, out of a total spend of £55,286 on directly provided concerts. This is well over double the amount allocated to Symphony Orchestras, at £18,471. The objectives of CEMA are clearly reflected in this expenditure: the overall grant to the Arts Council from the treasury was £175,000, so the provision of directly provided concerts in factories and hostels represented a significant proportion of the total expenditure.

1946

(N.b. The accounts to 31 March 1946 and to 31 March 1947 are both included in the Second Annual Report) The heading has been amended to Music and Opera, and there are two additions to the list of grant recipients: Covent Garden, which is awarded £25,000, and the rural Music Schools Council, which received

£1000. Overall, although the categories remain the same there is quite a churn in the level of the awards. The directly provided concerts come in at £43,228, with factories and hostels expenditure dropping to £27,038. The shift in the headings is important: it calls into question the notion of music as a catch-all. Art-forms are functioning not only in relation to their artistic fields, but also to other principles. Opera is, at the same time, music and not music.

1947

The heading continues as Music and Opera, and the two sub-headings of grants and guarantees are combined into one. The Covent Garden award has increased to £55,000 and has been joined by awards of £15,000 to Sadler's Wells, and £3,000 to Glyndebourne. Symphony Orchestras, having dropped to £10,244 in the previous year are back up to £25,878. The smaller awards to the EFDSS, Musicians Union, Rural Schools etc., have gone, and the directly provided concerts receive £36,073. The factories and hostels expenditure has dropped to £2,221, but the introduction of a new category, industrial music clubs at £12,299 keeps the overall total up.

1948

The Covent Garden award is now £98,000, with a further £23,000 to Sadler's Wells. Symphony Orchestras are down to £12,453, and factories and hostels expenditure is now zero, although the overall directly provided concert budget is still £30,907, with the Industrial Music Clubs receiving £11,020.

1949

The categories shift again, with Opera and Ballet, and then Music as separate top-line headings. The total spending on Opera and Ballet comes in at £196,192,

with £145,000 to Covent Garden, £40,000 to the Sadler's Wells Foundation, £5,000 to the English Opera Group and £6,912 in miscellaneous grants and guarantees. The Music total is £124,845, with the Industrial Music Clubs receiving £5,563.

1950

Opera and ballet total £233,893. Music totals £115,315. The Industrial Music Clubs stand at £3,125.

1951

The categories continue with Opera and Ballet as one heading and Music as another. The Opera and Ballet total stands at £202,292, the Music total at 109,873. Covent Garden receives £145,000. The Industrial Music Clubs receive £2,174.

1952

Opera and ballet receives £219,925, Music receives £106,626, with the grants and guarantees categories described as Symphony Orchestras, Chamber and String Orchestras, String Quartets, and miscellaneous. The Industrial Music Clubs are not funded and do not reappear in any later account.

1953

Opera and ballet receive £347,275 (of which £265,000 is for the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden), Music receives £73,236 (including £11,819 to The National Federation of Music Societies, and £6,755 for 'direct grants and guarantees to music clubs for concerts'). The English Folk Dance and Song Society reappears with an award of £500 (for international festival 1952), with

the rest of the awards best described as orchestral/classical.

1954

Opera and ballet receive £370,392 over seven organisations, with £240,000 to the Royal Opera House and £100,000 to the Sadler's Wells Foundation; Music receives £83,557 over twenty-one organisations, including funds for the National Federation of Music Societies.

1955

Opera and ballet receive £399,500 over six organisations; Music receives £84,533 over twenty-two organisations, again including funds for the National Federation of Music Societies.

1956

Opera and Ballet receive £418,179; Music receives £89,168.

1957

Opera and Ballet receive £473,200; Music receives £94,125 (with the number of funded organisations dropping to fourteen).

1958

Music comes back as the headline category, split into two sub-headings: Opera and Ballet, and Other Activities. Opera and Ballet receive £531,250; Other Activities £113,452.

1959

Music continues as the headline category, with Opera and Ballet, and Other

Activities as the sub-headings. Opera and Ballet receive £612,453, including £362,000 for the Royal Opera House; Symphony Orchestras, which are split out in the detailed schedule, received £85,550; Other Activities, received £37,196.

1960

Music is firmly established as the top heading again. Opera and ballet receive £709,730; Symphony Orchestras £91,000, and Other Activities £41,451. The National Federation of Music Societies continues to be funded, receiving £22,459.

1961

The structure continues as before, with Opera and Ballet now receiving £821,626. The Royal Opera House receives £500,737, and Sadler's Wells £275,000; Symphony Orchestras £126,267; and Other Activities £48,059.

1962

Opera and Ballet receive £926,602, with the Royal Opera House on £505,991 and Sadler's Wells on £365,000; Symphony Orchestras receive £145,500; Other Activities £45,331. The grant to the National Federation of Music Societies stands at £28,357.

1963

Opera and ballet make it to £1,143,676, with the Royal Opera House receiving £690,041; symphony orchestras receive £153,750; and Other Activities £51,727. For reference, the total grant in aid in 1963, including payments for Scotland and Wales which were administered separately, was £2,190,000.

1964

Opera and Ballet total 1,324,482, with £815,000 to the Royal Opera House;
Symphony Orchestras £258,500; and Other Activities £52,557.

Appendix Four: Arts Council Annual Reports and Accounts

This appendix sets out four areas of detail that were used to identify points of interest and trends over time within the Arts Council Annual Reports and Accounts from 1965 through to 1997

- The Advisory Panel Structure
- the narrative headings used within the Annual Reports
- The account headings used to describe Grants and Guarantees awarded by the Arts Council and the amounts awarded
- The departmental structure, using the list of operational directors as source material

Advisory Panels 1964-1997

These are the advisory panels listed in the Annual Reports. Of particular interest is the constant presence of the core art-form categories.

1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1969-70
Art	Art	Art	Art	Art
Drama	Drama	Drama	Drama	Music
Music	Music	Literature	Literature	Drama
Poetry	Literature	Music	Music	Literature
		Young People's Theatre	Young People's Theatre	Young People's Theatre
1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75
Art	Art	Art	Art	Panels
Drama	exhibitions Sub-Committee	Exhibitions Sub-Committee	Exhibitions Sub-Committee	Art
Training Committee	Photography Committee	Photography Committee	Photography Committee	Exhibitions Sub-Committee
Theatre Technicians' Working Party	Serpentine Gallery Committee	Serpentine Gallery Committee	Serpentine Gallery Committee	Performance Arts Committee
Directors' Working Group	Drama	Drama	Performance Art Committee	Photography Committee
Designers' Working Group	Training Committee	Training Committee	Drama	Serpentine Gallery Committee
Drama Schools Working Group	New Drama Committee	New Drama Committee	Fringe and Experimental Drama Committee	Drama
New Drama Committee	Experimental Drama Committee	Experimental Drama Committee	New Drama Committee	Fringe and Experimental Drama Committee
Theatre Administration Working Party	Young People's Theatre Committee	Young People's Theatre Committee	Young People's Theatre Committee	New Drama Committee
Literature	Literature	Literature	Literature	Young People's Theatre Committee
Music	Fiction Book Club sub-committee	Literary Magazines Sub-Committee	National Manuscript Collection of Contemporary Writer's Committee	Literature
Ballet Sub-Committee	Literary Magazines Sub-Committee	National Manuscript Collection of Contemporary Writer's Committee	Music	National Manuscript Collection of Contemporary Writers' Committee
General Sub-Committee	Translation Sub-Committee	Music	Dance-Theatre Sub-Committee	Music
Recording Sub-Committee	Writers in Factories Sub-Committee	Dance Theatre Sub-Committee	General Sub-Committee	Dance Theatre Sub-Committee
Jazz Sub-Committee	National Manuscript Collection of Contemporary Writers' Committee	General Sub-Committee	Jazz Sub-Committee	General Sub-Committee
Art Film Committee	Music	Jazz Sub-Committee	Opera Sub-Committee	Jazz Sub-Committee
Experimental Projects Committee	dance Theatre Sub-Committee	Opera Sub-Committee	Piano Sub-Committee	Opera Sub-Committee
National Manuscript Collection of Contemporary Writers' Committee	General Sub-Committee	Piano Sub-Committee	Committee for the British Section of the International Society of Contemporary Music	Committee for the British Section of the International Society of Contemporary Music
Theatre Touring Committee	London Orchestras Programmes Committee	Committee for the British Section of the International Society of Contemporary Music	Regional Committee	Regional Committee
	Jazz Sub-Committee	Art Film Committee	Touring Sub-Committee	Arts Centres Sub-Committee
	Opera Sub-Committee	Artists' Films Sub-Committee	Art Film Committee	Community Arts Committee
	Piano Sub-Committee	Experimental Projects Committee	Artists' Films Sub-Committee	Art Film Committee
	Art Film Committee		Training Committee	Artists' Films Sub-Committee
	Experimental Projects Committee		Actors' and Drama Schools' Working Group	Touring Committee
	Theatre Touring Committee		Designers' Working Group	Training Committee
			Directors' Working Group	Administration sub-committee
			Technicians' Working Group	Actors' and Drama Schools' Working Group
				Designers' Working Group
				Directors' Working Group
				Technicians' Working Group

1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
Housing the Arts Committee	Housing the Arts Committee	Housing the Arts Committee	Housing the Arts Committee	
Panels	Panels	Panels	Panels	Art Advisory Panel
Arts	Art Panel	Art Advisory Panel	Art Advisory Panel	Exhibitions sub-committee
Exhibitions Sub-Committee	Art Publishing Committee	Art Finance Committee	Art Finance Committee	Art Films Advisory Committee
Photography Committee	Exhibition Sub-Committee	Art Publishing Sub-Committee	Art Publishing Sub-Committee	Artists' Films and Video Sub Committee
Serpentine Gallery Committee	Photography Committee	Exhibition Sub-Committee	Exhibitions Sub-Committee	Dance Advisory Panel
Drama	Serpentine Gallery Committee	Photography Sub-Committee	Photography	Dance and Mime Projects and Awards Sub-Committee
Standards and Reassessment Committee Projects and New Applications Committee	Support Schemes for Artists Sub-Committee	Support Schemes for Artists' Sub-Committee	Serpentine Gallery Sub-Committee	Drama Advisory Panel
	Drama	Support Schemes for Photographers' Sub-Committee	Support Schemes for Artists Sub-Committee	New Applications and Projects Sub-Committee
New Writing Committee	Drama Finance Committee	Drama Advisory Panel	Drama Advisory Panel	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Sub-Committee
Literature	Review Committee	Drama Finance Committee	Drama Finance Committee	Housing the Arts Advisory Committee
National Manuscript Collection of Contemporary Writers Committee	New Applications and Projects Committee	New Applications and Projects Committee	New Applications and Projects Committee	Literature Advisory Panel
Community Bookshops Working Party	New Writing Committee	New Writing Committee	Theatre Writing Committee	Music Advisory Panel
Publishing Imprint Sub-Committee	Literature	Review Committee	Literature Advisory Panel	International Society for Contemporary Music (British Section)
Music	Literature Finance Committee	Literature Advisory Panel	Literature Finance Committee	Music Award and Bursaries Sub-Committee
Dance Theatre Sub-Committee	National Manuscript Collection of Contemporary Writers Committee	National Manuscript Collection of Contemporary Writers' Committee	National Manuscript Collection of Contemporary Writers Committee	Regional Advisory Committee
General Sub-Committee	Music	Music Advisory Panel	Music Advisory Panel	Community Arts Sub-Committee
Jazz Sub-Committee	Music Finance Committee	Music Finance Committee	Music Finance Committee	Research Advisory Group
Opera Sub Committee	Dance Theatre Sub-Committee	General Sub-Committee	General Sub-Committee	Special Applications Advisory Committee
Committee for the British Section of the International Society of Contemporary Music	General Sub-Committee	Jazz Sub-Committee	Jazz Sub-Committee	Touring Advisory Committee
Regional Committee	Jazz Sub-Committee	Opera Sub-Committee	Opera Sub-Committee	Training Advisory Committee
Arts Centres Sub-Committee	Opera Sub-Committee	Recording Sub-Committee	Recording Sub-Committee	Specialist Allocations Board
Community Arts Committee	International Society for Contemporary Music (British Section)	International Society for Contemporary Music (British Section)	International Society for Contemporary Music (British Section)	
Art Films Committee	Regional Committee	Arts Films Committee	Arts Films Committee	
Artists' Films Sub-Committee	Arts Centres Sub-Committee	Artists' Films Sub-Committee	Artists Films Sub-Committee	
Touring Committee	Community Arts Committee	Dance Advisory Committee	Dance Advisory Committee	
Touring Finance and Policy Sub-Committee	Arts Films Committee	New Dance and Mime Sub-Committee	New Dance and Mime Sub-Committee	
Training Committee	Artists' Films Sub-Committee	Dance Theatre for Young Peoples' Sub-Committee	Dance Theatre for Young Peoples Sub-Committee	
Actors and Drama Schools Working Group	Touring Committee	Regional Committee	Regional Committee	
Administration Sub-Committee	Touring Finance Committee	Arts Centres Sub-Committee	Arts Centres Sub-Committee	
Designers Working Group	Training Committee	Arts Festivals Committee	Arts Festivals Committee	
Directors Working Group	Administration Sub-Committee	Community Arts Committee	Community Arts Committee	
Technicians Working Group	Actors and Drama Schools Working Group	Research Advisory Group	Research Advisory Group	
Special Applications Committee	Designers Working Group	Special Applications Committee	Special Applications Committee	
	Directors Working Group	Touring Committee	Touring Committee	
	Technicians and Stage Management Working Group	Training Committee	Training Committee	
		Administration Sub-Committee	Administration Sub-Committee	
		Actors and Drama Schools Working Group	Designers Working Group	
		Designers Working Group	Directors Working Group	
		Directors Working Group	Performers Working Group	
		Technicians and Stage Management Working Group	Technicians and Stage Management Working Group	

1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Finance and Policy Committee				
Panels	Advisory Panel on Art	Advisory Panel on Art	Advisory Panel on Art	Advisory Panel on Art
Art Advisory Panel	Exhibitions Sub-Committee	Exhibitions Sub-Committee	Exhibitions Sub-Committee	Exhibitions sub-committee
Exhibitions Sub-Committee	Advisory Committee on Arts Films	Advisory Committee on Arts Films	Advisory Committee on Arts Films	Advisory Committee on Arts Films
Artists' Films and Video Sub-Committee	Artists' Film and Video Sub-Committee	Artists' Film and Video Sub-Committee	Artists' Films and Video Sub-Committee	Artists' Film and Video Sub-Committee
Dance Advisory Panel	Advisory Panel on Dance	Advisory Panel on Dance	Advisory Panel on Dance	Advisory Panel on Dance
Dance and Mime Projects and Awards Sub-Committee	Dance and Mime Projects and Awards Sub-Committee	Dance and Mime Projects and Awards	Dance and Mime Projects and Awards Sub-Committee	Dance and Mime Projects and Awards Sub-Committee
Drama Advisory Panel	Advisory Panel on Drama	Advisory Panel on Drama	Advisory Panel on Drama	Advisory Panel on Drama
Projects Sub-Committee	Projects Sub-Committee	Projects Sub-Committee	Projects Sub-Committee	Projects sub-committee
Theatre Writing and Bursaries Sub-Committee	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Sub-Committee	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Sub-Committee	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Sub-Committee	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Sub-Committee
Housing the Arts Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee on Housing the Arts	Advisory Committee on Housing the Arts	Advisory Panel on Literature	Advisory Panel on Literature
Literature Advisory Panel	Advisory Panel on Literature	Advisory Panel on Literature	Advisory Panel on Music	Advisory Panel on Music
Music Advisory Panel;	Advisory Panel on Music	Advisory Panel on Music	New Music Sub-Committee	New Music Sub-Committee
Regional Advisory Committee	New Music Sub-Committee	New Music Sub-Committee	Advisory Group on Photography	Advisory Group on Photography
Community Arts Sub-Committee	Regional Advisory Committee	Advisory Group on Photography	Regional Advisory Committee	Regional Advisory Committee
Special Applications Advisory Committee	Combined Arts Sub-Committee	Regional Advisory Committee	Combined Arts Sub-Committee	Combined Arts Sub-Committee
Touring Advisory Committee	Touring Sub-Committee	Combined Arts Sub-Committee	Touring Sub-Committee	Touring Sub-Committee
Training Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee on Training	Touring Sub-Committee	Advisory Committee on Training	Advisory Committee on Training
Specialist Allocations Board		Advisory Committee on Training		South Bank Group

1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
Advisory Panel on Art	none listed	Advisory Panel on Art	Advisory Panel on Art	Advisory Panel on Art	Advisory Panel on Art
Exhibitions Committee		Arts Projects Committee	Arts Projects Committee	Arts Projects Committee	Art Projects Committee
Art Projects Committee		Photography Advisory Group	Advisory Group on Photography	Advisory Group on Photography	Photography Advisory Group
Advisory Committee on Combined Arts		Advisory Panel on Dance and Mime	Advisory Group on Dance	Advisory Panel on Dance	Advisory Panel on Dance
Advisory Panel on Dance and Mime		Dance and Mime Projects and Awards Committee	Dance Projects and Awards Committee	Dance Projects and Awards Committee	Dance Education and Outreach Committee
Dance and Mime Projects and Awards Committee		Dance and Mime Education and Outreach Committee	Dance Education and Outreach Committee	Dance Education and Outreach Committee	Advisory Panel on Drama
Dance and Mime Education and Outreach Committee		Advisory Panel on Drama	Advisory Panel on Drama	Advisory Panel on Drama	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee
Advisory Panel on Drama		Drama Projects Committee	Drama Projects Committee	Drama Projects Committee	Projects Committee
Drama Projects Committee		Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee	Advisory Panel on Film, Video and Broadcasting
Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee		Film Video and Broadcasting Panel	Film, Video and Broadcasting Panel	Film, Video and Broadcasting Panel	Arts Films Production Committee
Advisory Panel on Film, Video and Broadcasting		Artists Film and Video Committee	Artists Film and Video Committee	Artists Film and Video Committee	Artists Film and Video Committee
Arts Film Production Committee		Art Films Production Committee	Arts Films Production Committee	Arts Films Production Committee	Advisory Panel on Literature
Artists's Film and Video Committee		Literature Panel	Literature Panel	Literature Panel	Music Panel
Advisory Panel on Literature		Music Panel	Music Panel	Music Panel	Music Projects and Awards Committee
Advisory Panel on Music		Music Projects and Awards Committee	Music Projects and Awards Committee	Music Projects and Awards Committee	Contemporary Music Network Committee
Music Projects and Awards Committee		Touring Board	Touring Board	Touring Board	Touring Board
Advisory Group on Photography		Touring Projects Committee	Touring Projects Committee	Touring Projects Committee	Planning Board
Advisory Board: Planning and Development		Planning Board	Planning Board	Contemporary Music Network Committee	Education Committee
Education Committee		Education Committee	Education Committee	Planning Board	Arts and Disability Monitoring
Advisory Committee on Training		Training Committee	Training Committee	Education Committee	Training Committee
Advisory Board: Touring		Monitoring Committee: Ethnic Minority Arts	Monitoring Committee: Ethnic Minority Arts	Monitoring Committee: Arts and Disability	
Monitoring Committee (Ethnic Minority Arts Action Plan)		Monitoring Committee: Arts and Disability	Monitoring Committee: Arts and Disability	Training Committee	
South Bank Board					

1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97
			Advisory Panel on Visual Arts and Photography	Advisory Panel on Visual Arts	Advisory Panel on Combined Arts
Advisory Panel on Art	Advisory Panel on Art	Advisory Panel on Visual Arts			Combined Arts Projects Committee
Art Projects Committee	Art Projects Committee	Art Projects Committee	Art Projects Committee	Architecture Advisory Group	Cultural Diversity Advisory and Monitoring Committee
Architecture Advisory Group	Architecture Advisory Group	Advisory Group on Photography	Advisory Group on Photography	Visual Arts Publications Committee	
Photography Advisory Group	Photography Advisory Group	Advisory Group on Architecture	Advisory Group on Architecture	Visual Arts Exhibitions and Events Committee	Advisory Panel on Dance
Advisory Panel on Dance	Combined Arts Committee	Combined Arts Committee	Combined Arts Committee	Education and Training Advisory Group	Dance Development Advisory Team
Dance Development Advisory Team	Advisory Panel on Dance	Advisory Panel on Dance	Advisory Panel on Dance	Photography and New Technology Advisory Group	Arts and Disability Advisory and Monitoring Committee
Dance Education and Outreach Committee	Dance Development Advisory Team	Dance Education and Outreach	Dance Development Advisers	Visual Arts Advisory Group	Advisory Panel on Drama
Advisory Panel on Drama	Dance Education and Outreach Committee	Dance Development Advisory Team	Advisory Panel on Drama	Advisory Panel on Combined Arts	Drama Projects Committee
Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee	Advisory Panel on Drama	Advisory Panel on Drama	Drama Projects Committee	Advisory Panel on Dance	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee
Projects Committee	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee	Drama Projects Committee	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee	Dance Development Advisory Team	Advisory Panel on Education and Training
Advisory Panel on Film, Video and Broadcasting	Projects Committee	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee	Advisory Panel on Film, Video and Broadcasting	Advisory Panel on Drama	Advisory Panel on Film, Video and Broadcasting
Arts Films Production Committee	Advisory Panel on Film, Video and Broadcasting	Advisory Panel on Film, Video and Broadcasting	Arts Film Production Committee	Drama Projects Committee	Advisory Panel on Literature
Artists' Film and Video Committee	Arts Films Production Committee	Arts Films Production Committee	Artists' Film and Video Production Committee	Theatre Writing and Bursaries Committee	Advisory Panel on Music
Advisory Panel on Literature	Artists' Film and Video Committee	Artists' Film and Video Committee	Advisory Panel on Literature	Advisory Panel on Education and Training	Advisory Panel on Touring
Advisory Panel on Music	Advisory Panel on Literature	Advisory Panel on Literature	Advisory Panel on Music	Education and Training Funding Programmes Sub-Committee	Contemporary Music Network Committee
Contemporary Music Network	Advisory Panel on Music	Advisory Panel on Music	National Lottery Advisory Board	Disability Employment Initiative Apprenticeship Scheme Sub-Committee	Advisory Panel on Visual Arts
Education Committee	Contemporary Music Network	Contemporary Music Network	Contemporary Music Network	Advisory Panel on Film Video and Broadcasting	Architecture Advisory Group
Advisory Board on Touring	Education Committee	Advisory Board on Touring	Advisory Board on Touring	Advisory Panel on Literature	Visual Arts Publications Committee
Arts and Disability Monitoring Committee	Advisory Board on Touring	Arts and Disability Monitoring Committee	Education Committee	Advisory Panel on Music	Visual Arts Exhibitions and Events Committee
Training Committee	Arts and Disability Monitoring Committee	Training Committee	Arts and Disability Monitoring Committee	Contemporary Music Network Committee	Visual Arts Educational Training Group
	Training Committee	Women in the Arts Monitoring Committee	Women in the Arts Monitoring Committee	National Lottery Advisory Panel	Photography and New Technology Advisory Group
	Budget Committee	Budget Committee		Advisory Panel on Touring	Visual Arts Advisory Group
				Arts and Disability Advisory and Monitoring Committee	National Lottery Advisory Panel
				Cultural Diversity Advisory and Monitoring Committee (in respect of Black and Asian Arts)	Lottery Architecture Advisory Committee
					Arts for Everyone Advisory and Selection Panel
					National Lottery Stabilisation Committee
					Advisory Panel on Film
					Film Franchise Review Committee

Annual Report Narrative Headings 1964-1997

These are the headings used within the narrative reports. Of particular interest is the repeated disappearance and reappearance of art-form categories as narrative headings

1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
Introduction	Introduction	Introduction	Membership	A Chairman's	Chairman's Introduction
The Event of the Year	Helping Artists	A new charter	Changes and moves	Membership of Council	Secretary-General's Report
Committee on the London Orchestras	First Aid for Writers	On the margin	4 St James's Square	Secretary-General's report	Introduction
Recovery in the Theatre	Housing the Arts	Housing the Arts	The new London exhibition gallery	I Introduction	Subsidy Needs Differ
Festivals	The Arts in the Regions	Theatre for young people	Regional developments	II Analysis of spending	Regional Events - their quality and importance
Literature (including Poetry)	Theatre for Young People	Report on the needs of the subsidized theatre in London	Housing the arts	III The arts and the export figures	The museum concept
Scotland	Yvonne Arnaud Theatre, Guildford	Changes in the musical scene	Current enquiries	IV Enquires and working parties	The grant-in-aid
Wales	Seligman Bequest	Poetry in the making	Training schemes	V Select committee on estimates	Analysis of Spending
Appendices	Opera for All: the New Tripod	Scotland	Art films	The Regions	Category one: institutions with national coverage
A Music, Opera and Ballet	Scotland	Wales	The Compton Poetry Trust and the first Compton Poetry Lectureship	Scotland	Category two: Supported organisations
B Drama	Wales	Appendices	Two international conferences	Wales	Category three: Literature
C Art	Appendices	A The new charter	Scotland	Accountant's notes	Category four: Festivals
D Poetry	A Music, Opera and Ballet	B List of art exhibitions	Wales	Annual accounts	Category five: Regional Arts Associations
	B Drama	C List of poetry manuscripts	Annual Accounts		Category six: housing the Arts
					Arts Council Policy - Enquiries and working parties
	C Art				
	D Poetry				

1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75
Chairman's Introduction	Chairman's Introduction	Chairman's Introduction	Chairman's Introduction	Chairman's Introduction
The Chairman: a tribute	Secretary- General's Report	Secretary-General's Report	Secretary-General's Report	Secretary-General's Report
The first twenty-five years: a report by the Secretary-	The accounts summarised	Membership of Council and Staff	Membership of Council and Staff	Introduction
I introduction	Rolling Triennium	Scotland	Scotland	Part I Main Areas of Expansion
II Fifteen years' achievement in the arts	Operating Costs	Wales	Wales	Scotland and Wales
III The new method of promotion	Artists and the Arts Council	Annual Accounts	Annual Accounts	Reigonal Arts Associations
IV The Council's regional involvement	The Council's Departmental Structure			Touring
V Summary and prospects	New Methods			Dance and Opera
Appendices to the Secretary-General's Report	Policy trends, as shown by the accounts			Arts Centres and regional Projects
I Art	Four Themes			Part II Departmental developments
II Drama	Audiences and Attendances			Development in the work of the Art, Drama, Music and Literature
III Literature	Festivals			Music Department
IV Music	Orchestras			Drama Department
V Festivals	The Largest Organisations			Art Department
VI Housing the Arts	The small scale			Literature Department
	British Rail - Music and Theatre Line			Inflation and the Arts
	Publicity and Adminstration			Part III New attitudes and the money situation
	Publicity			Return on the Money
	Seat Prices			Reasons for Optimism
	Arts Administration			New Attitudes
	Peat, Marwick Report			The Adequacy of the Money
	Regional Arts Associations			
	Touring and the Opera Situation			
	Opera			
	Conclusion			

1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
Staff	Chairman's Introduction	Chairman's Introduction	Chairman's Introduction	Regional Development
Chairman's introduction	Secretary-General's Report	Secretary-General's Report	Secretary-General's Report	Regional Arts Associations
Secretary-General's Report	Regional Activities	Regional Development	Regional Development	Arts Council Touring
Scotland	Drama	Drama	Drama	Community Arts
Wales	Drama 1948-1977 (a personal comment by N.V. Linklater)	Music and Dance	Music and Dance	Arts Centres
Membership of Council and Staff	Music	Visual Arts	Visual Arts	Arts Festivals
Council, Committees and Panels	Visual Arts	Literature	Literature	Drama
Annual Accounts	Literature	Touring	Touring	Aspects of Finance
	Touring	Arts Centres	Festivals	New Work in the Theatre
	Community Arts	Community Arts	Arts Centres	Music
	Festivals	Performance Art	Community Arts	Contemporary Music
	Housing the Arts	Festivals	Performance Art	Visual Arts
	Training	Housing the Arts	Ethnic Arts	Photography
	Research and Information	Training	Marketing	Arts Films
	Marketing	Research and Information	Housing the Arts	Performance Art
	Scotland	Marketing	Training	Dance
	Wales	Scotland	Education	Literature
	Membership of Council and Staff	Wales	Research and Information	National Book Awards
	Council, Committees and Panels	Membership of Council and Staff	Press Office	Poetry Library
	Annual Accounts	Council, Committees and Panels and Exhibitions	Publications	Housing the Arts
			Scotland	Training
			Wales	Education
			Membership of Council and Staff	Personnel and Administration
			Council, Committees and Panels	
			Annual Accounts, Awards, Funds and Exhibitions	

1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87
Chairman's Introduction	Council	Chairman's	Chairman's	Chairman's	Chairman's introduction	Secretary-General's
Secretary-General's Report	Chairman's Introduction	Secretary-General's Preface	Secretary-General's Preface	Secretary-General's Report	Secretary-General's Preface	Finance Director's Notes
Regional Development	Secretary-General's Preface	Reports from the Departments	Departmental Reports	Departmental Reports	highlights of the Year	Foreword
Drama	Scotland	Scotland	Scotland	Art	Activity Reviews	Arts Council of Great Britain Accounts
Music	Wales	Wales	Wales	Photography	Abolition and the arts	Scottish Arts Council Accounts
Visual Arts	Membership of Council and Staff	Council	Council	Arts Films	Equal opportunities	Welsh Arts Council Accounts
Dance	Advisory Panels and Committees	Membership of Council and Staff	Membership of Council and Staff	Dance and Mime	Making the case for the arts	South Bank Chairman's Foreword
Literature	Staff	Advisory Panels and Committees	Advisory Panels and Committees	Drama	Four years of education development	South Bank Board Accounts
Housing the Arts	Annual Accounts	Staff	Staff	Education	Regional development	
Training	Funds, Exhibitions, Schemes and Awards	Annual Accounts	Annual Accounts	Literature	Departmental Reports	
Education		Funds, Exhibitions, Schemes and Awards	Funds, Exhibitions, Schemes and Awards	Music	Art	
Personnel and Administration				Regional	Dance and Mime	
Scotland				Training	Drama	
Wales					Film, Video &	
Membership of Council and Staff					Literature	
Council, Committees and Panels					Music	
Annual Accounts, Funds and Exhibitions					Touring	
					Training	

1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93
Chairman's introduction	Chairman's introduction	Chairman's introduction	Chairman's introduction	Chairman's introduction	Chairman's Introduction
Secretary-General's report	Secretary-General's report	Secretary-General's report	Secretary-General's report	Secretary-General's report	Secretary-General's Report
Arts review	Income Profile	Income analysis	Audiences	Audiences	Highlights of the Year
Special reports	Arts Review	Audiences	Arts Review	Arts review	Financial Summary
Appraisals	Scottish Arts Council	Arts Review	Scottish Arts Council	Scottish Arts Council report	Arts Attenders
Urban renaissance	Welsh Arts Council	Scottish Arts Council	Welsh Arts Council	Welsh Arts Council report	Departmental Reports
Business and the arts	Special reports	Welsh Arts Council	A personal view	Education	The Arts Council and the Arts Funding System
Income profiles	The Council	A personal view	Membership of Council, Arts Council staff, advisory structure	Making it happen	Regional Arts Boards
South Bank report	Membership of Council and staff	The Council, membership of Council and Arts Council staff, advisory structure	Annual accounts	The Council	Scottish and Welsh Arts Council Reports
Welsh Arts Council	Advisory structure	Annual accounts	Income analysis	Membership of Council and staff	Case Studies
Scottish Arts Council	Annual accounts	Arts Council Structure	Summary for the partially sighted	Advisory structure	The Council
The Council	Arts Council structure	Summary		Annual accounts	Membership of Council and Staff
Membership of Council and staff	Summary for the partially sighted				Advisory Structure
Advisory structure					Sponsorship
Arts Council structure					Annual Accounts
Summary for the partially sighted					
Annual accounts					

1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97
Chairman's introduction	Chairman's report	Chairman's introduction	Chairman's statement
Secretary-General's report	Secretary-General's report	An abridged version of a speech given in the House of Lords by Lord Gowrie on 12 June 1996	Secretary-General's report
Highlights of the year	Summary of clients' income	Secretary-General's report	Guest essay by David Puttnam
Financial summary	Grants by art form	No public subsidy, no West End	Financial summary, performance indicators, spending by region
Arts audiences	Attendances at arts events	Financial summary, performance indicators, spending by regions	Departmental reports
Departmental reports	Per capita spending by region	Departmental reports	Combined Arts
Regional Arts Boards	The National Lottery	Combined Arts	Dance
Scottish and Welsh Arts Council reports	Departmental reports	Dance	Drama
The Arts Council of Great Britain 1946-1994	Combined Arts	Drama	Education and Training
Profiles of Council members	Dance	Education and Training	Film, Video and Broadcasting
Membership of Council and staff	Drama	Film, Video and Broadcasting	Literature
Advisory structure	Film, Video and Broadcasting	Literature	Music
The Arts Council and the arts funding system	Literature	Music	Touring
Annual Accounts	Music	Touring	Visual Arts
	Touring	Visual Arts	National Lottery overview
	Visual Arts	National Lottery	National Lottery reports
	Education and Training	The Arts Council Collection	The Arts Council Collection
	Policy research	Regional Arts Boards	Regional Arts Boards
	Arts Council Collection	The Council members	The Council
	An international perspective	Membership of Council and staff	Membership of Council and staff
	Regional Arts Boards	Advisory structure	Advisory structure
	The Council Members	Accounts 1995/1996	Accounts 1996/97
	Membership of Council and staff	compliance with policy and financial directions	compliance with policy and financial directions
	Advisory structure	Partnership funding for ACE Lottery grants over £5m awarded in 1995/96	Notes on large print versions and accessibility
	Annual accounts	Notes on large print versions and accessibility	
	Notes on large print versions and accessibility		

Account headings and amounts for Grant and Guarantees 1964-1997

This is the list of grants and guarantees annually through to 1997. Note for example the change in the category Arts Association.

1964-65			1965-66		
Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings			Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings		
Music		£ 1,950,055	Music		£ 2,169,001
Opera and ballet	£ 1,586,672		Opera and Ballet	£ 1,714,213	
Symphony Orchestras	£ 300,500		Orchestras	£ 378,725	
Other Activities	£ 62,883		Other Activities	£ 76,063	
Drama		£ 545,092	Drama		£ 766,066
List of funded organisations	£ 545,092		List of funded organisations	£ 766,066	
Art		£ 11,250	Art		£ 29,480
List of funded organisations	£ 11,250		List of funded organisations	£ 29,840	
Arts Festival		£ 26,249	Arts Festivals		£ 18,006
List of funded festivals	£ 26,249		List of funded organisations and events	£ 18,006	
Poetry		£ 4,494	Literature (including Poetry)		£ 8,080
List of funded organisations	£ 4,494		List of funded organisations, busarries and prizes	£ 8,080	
Arts Associations		£ 38,170	Arts associations		£ 51,550
Midland Arts Association:			Midland Arts Association:		
Administration	£ 625		Administration	£ 1,250	
Transport subsidy	£ 500		Transport subsidy	£ 250	
Arts Centres and Arts Clubs			Arts Centres and Arts Clubs		
Alfreton and District Arts Association	£ 130		Alfreton and District Arts Association	£ 125	
Boston: Blackfriars Trust Appeal	£ 500		Bridgnorth: Theatre on the steps	£ 300	
Cannock Arts Council	£ 35		Cannock Arts Council	£ 135	
Coventry: Umbrella Club	£ 275		Coventry: Umbrella Club	£ 285	
Dudley Arts Council	£ 150		Dudley Arts Council	£ 125	
Kettering and District Three Arts Club	£ 60		Kettering and District Three Arts Club	£ 100	
Leek and District Arts Club	£ 100		Leek and District Arts Club	£ 125	
Lincoln Society of Arts	£ 60		Solihull Society of Arts	£ 50	
Solihull Society of Arts	£ 40		Stafford and District Arts Council	£ 275	
Stafford and District Arts Council	£ 275		Wolverhampton Civic Hall Arts Society	£ 30	
Tamworth Arts Club	£ 20				
Wolverhampton Civic Hall Arts Society	£ 30		Lincolnshire Association	£ 2,000	
			North Eastern Association for the Arts	£ 40,000	
North Eastern Association for the Arts	£ 30,000		South Western Arts Association:		
South Western Arts Association:			Administration	£ 3,250	
Administration	£ 2,375		Transport subsidy	£ 250	
Transport subsidy	£ 500		Arts Centres and Arts Clubs		
Arts Centres and Arts Clubs			Beaminster Arts Society	£ 100	
Blandford Arts Club	£ 75		Blandford Arts Club	£ 75	
Chippenham and District Society of Arts	£ 35		Bridgwater and District Arts Centre	£ 300	
Dawlish Arts Festivals	£ 30		Dawlish Repertory Company	£ 35	
Devon Guild of Craftsmen	£ 20		Devon Guild of Craftsmen	£ 20	
Exeter Arts Group	£ 150		Exeter Arts Group	£ 150	
Falmouth: Royal Cornwall Polytechnic Society	£ 300		Falmouth: Royal Cornwall Polytechnic Society	£ 325	
Isle of Purbeck Arts Club	£ 50		Isle of Purbeck Arts Club	£ 50	
Launceston Society of Arts	£ 125		Launceston Society of Arts	£ 50	
Minehead Arts Society	£ 150		Minehead Arts Society	£ 195	
Newton Abbot Society of Arts	£ 50		Newton Abbot Society of Arts	£ 50	
Plymouth Arts Centre	£ 300		Plymouth Arts Centre	£ 350	
St Austell Society of Arts	£ 400		St Austell Arts Centre	£ 350	
Shaftesbury and District Arts Club	£ 300		Shaftesbury and District Arts Club	£ 350	
Taunton Deane Society of Arts	£ 60		Taunton Deane Society of Arts	£ 60	
Truro Three Arts Society	£ 50		Truro Three Arts Society	£ 50	
Warminster Arts Club	£ 50		Warminster Arts Club	£ 70	
Weston-Super-Mare Society of Arts	£ 50		Weston-Super-Mare Society of Arts	£ 70	
Weymouth and South Dorset Arts Centre	£ 300		Weymouth and South Dorset Arts Centre	£ 350	
Arts Centres and Arts Clubs		£ 3,921			
List of funded organisations	£ 3,921				
			Arts Centres and Arts Clubs		£ 2,510
			List of funded organisations	£ 2,510	
Shakespeare Festival 1964	£ 16,550	£ 16,550			
Schedule 3 total		£ 2,595,781	Housing the Arts		£ 117,500
			Music	£ 2,000	
			Drama	£ 94,350	
			Arts Centres	£ 21,150	
			Schedule 3 Total		£ 3,162,193

1966-67			1967-68		
Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings			Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings		
Music		£ 2,827,195	Music		£ 3,212,886
Opera and Ballet	£ 2,140,800		Opera and ballet	£ 2,344,520	
Orchestras	£ 573,663		Concert Activities	£ 849,667	
Other activities	£ 104,464		Other activities	£ 18,669	
Drama		£ 1,352,223	Drama		£ 1,705,609
List of funded organisations	£ 1,352,223		List of funded organisations	£ 1,705,609	
Art		£ 46,246	Art		£ 91,319
List of funded organisations	£ 46,246		List of funded organisations	£ 91,319	
Arts Festivals		£ 30,238	Literature		£ 61,479
List of funded organisations and events	£ 30,238		List of funded organisations, bursaries, prizes and grants	£ 61,479	
Literature (including Poetry)		£ 50,123	Festivals		£ 22,811
List of funded organisations, bursaries and prizes	£ 50,123		List of funded organisations and events	£ 22,811	
Arts associations		£ 87,474	Arts associations		£ 115,700
Lincolnshire Association	£ 14,849		Greater London Arts Association	£ 2,500	
Midlands Association for the Arts	£ 1,750		Lincolnshire Association	£ 15,000	
Administration	£ 500		Midlands Association for the Arts		
Transport subsidy			Administration	£ 3,065	
Arts Centres and Arts Clubs			Transport subsidy	£ 600	
Alfreton and District Arts Association	£ 125		Arts Centres and Arts Clubs		
Bridgnorth: Theatre on the steps	£ 350		Alfreton and District Arts Association	£ 125	
Cannock Arts Council	£ 150		Avoncroft Arts Society	£ 95	
Coventry: Umbrella Club	£ 390		Birmingham Arts Association	£ 350	
Dudley Arts Council	£ 250		Bridgnorth: Theatre on the steps	£ 350	
Kettering and District Three Arts Club	£ 100		Cannock Arts Council	£ 100	
Leek and District Arts Club	£ 125		Coventry: Umbrella Club	£ 400	
Rugby: Percival Guildhouse	£ 150		Dudley Arts Council	£ 550	
Shirebrook and District Three Arts Club	£ 25		Kettering and District Three Arts Club	£ 100	
Shrewsbury and District Arts Association	£ 250		Leek and District Arts Club	£ 150	
Stafford and District Arts Council	£ 400		Northampton Arts Association	£ 80	
Wolverhampton Civic Hall Arts Society	£ 30		Rugby: Apollo Society	£ 120	
Worcester Arts Association	£ 30		Rugeley and District Arts Association	£ 130	
North Eastern Association for the Arts	£ 60,000		Shrewsbury and District Arts Association	£ 500	
South Western Arts Association:			Solihull Society of Arts	£ 20	
Administration	£ 3,750		Stafford and District Arts Association	£ 400	
Transport subsidy	£ 250		Warwick Festival	£ 175	
Cornish Review"	£ 500		Wellington Association of The Arts	£ 175	
Arts Centres and Arts Clubs			Wolverhampton Civic Hall Arts Society	£ 30	
Beaford Arts Centre Arts Society	£ 150		Worcester Arts Association	£ 150	
Beaminsters Arts Society	£ 100		Northern Arts Association	£ 73,250	
Blandford Arts Club	£ 75		North West Arts Association	£ 6,000	
Bridgwater and District Arts Centre	£ 300		South Western Arts Association:		
Bristol Arts Centre	£ 300		Administration	£ 5,000	
Dawlish Winter Arts Concerts	£ 35		Transport subsidy	£ 400	
Exeter Arts Group	£ 150		Bristol Sinfonia Limited (Tour)	£ 450	
Exeter University Arts Festival	£ 135		Arts Centres and Arts Clubs		
Falmouth: Royal Cornwall Polytechnic Society	£ 350		Beaford Centre	£ 550	
Isle of Purbeck Arts Club	£ 50		Beaminsters Arts Society	£ 100	
Launceston Society of Arts	£ 50		Blandford Arts Club	£ 55	
Minehead Arts Festival	£ 70		Bridgwater and District Arts Centre	£ 475	
Minehead Arts Society	£ 100		Bristol Arts Centre	£ 400	
Newton Abbot Society of Arts	£ 50		Dartington Society of Arts	£ 500	
Plymouth Arts Centre	£ 350		Exeter University Arts Festival	£ 150	
St Austell Arts Centre	£ 350		Falmouth: Royal Cornwall Polytechnic Society	£ 400	
Shaftesbury and District Arts Club	£ 350		Launceston Society of Arts	£ 70	
Taunton Deane Society of Arts	£ 60		Minehead Arts Festival	£ 675	
Truro Three Arts Society	£ 50		Minehead Arts Society	£ 150	
Warminster Arts Club	£ 50		Newton Abbot Society of Arts	£ 75	
Weston-Super-Mare Society of Arts	£ 25		Plymouth Arts Centre	£ 400	
Weymouth and South Dorset Arts Centre	£ 350		St Austell Arts Centre	£ 400	
			Shaftesbury Arts Club	£ 400	
		£ 2,910	Taunton Deane Society of Arts	£ 60	
Arts centres and arts clubs	£ 2,910		Truro Three Arts Society	£ 50	
List of funded organisations			Warminster Arts Club	£ 75	
			Weston-Super-Mare Society of Arts	£ 50	
Housing the arts		£ 182,450	Weymouth and South Dorset Arts Centre	£ 400	
Music	£ 32,250				
Drama	£ 92,050		Arts centres and arts clubs		£ 2,125
Art	£ 44,450		List of funded organisations	£ 2,125	
Arts Centres	£ 13,700				
Schedule 3 Total		£ 4,578,859	Education in the arts		£ 137,528
			List of funded organisations	£ 5,985	
			Music	£ 131,543	
			Housing the arts		£ 204,300
			Music	£ 27,500	
			Drama	£ 147,700	
			Art	£ 19,500	
			Arts centres	£ 9,600	
			Schedule 3 total		£ 5,553,757

1968-70			1969-70	
Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings			Schedule 3 headings and sub headings	
Music		£ 3,303,491		£ 2,661,500
Opera and ballet	£ 2,414,250		Royal Opera House Covent Garden Limited	£ 1,400,000
Concert activities	£ 817,983		Sadler's Wells Trust Limited	£ 762,000
Music festivals	£ 43,194		National Theatre Board	£ 270,500
Other activities	£ 28,064		Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 229,000
Drama		£ 1,833,712	Music	£ 1,186,924
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 1,833,712		Opera and Ballet	£ 306,359
			Concert activities	£ 816,436
Art		£ 109,129	Music festivals	£ 29,837
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 77,505		Other activities	£ 34,292
Grants and guarantees towards exhibtions	£ 13,500			
Works of Art for Public Buildings	£ 7,250		Drama	£ 1,403,079
Provision of studios	£ 3,000		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 1,403,079
<i>Awards and commisions</i>	£ 7,874			
			Art	£ 95,552
Literature		£ 64,381	<i>Listed of funded organisations</i>	£ 68,800
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 13,326		Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 8,803
<i>List of funded publications and presses</i>	£ 9,705		Works of art for public buildings	£ 2,000
<i>Prizes, bursaries and grants</i>	£ 41,350		Provision of studios	£ 3,000
			Commissions	£ 8,525
Festivals		£ 21,589	Discretionary awards	£ 4,424
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 21,589			
			Literature	£ 71,796
Arts associations		£ 147,738	<i>list of funded organisations</i>	£ 19,286
Greater London Arts Association	£ 3,500		Literary Magazines	£ 8,340
Lincolnshire Association	£ 15,000		Little presses	£ 2,000
Midlands Associations for the Arts	£ 11,090		Grants to writers	£ 39,450
Northern Arts Association	£ 85,600		Grants to translators	£ 1,000
North West Arts Association	£ 15,250		Grants to publishers	£ 1,720
South Western Arts Association	£ 17,200			
Yorkshire Council of Social Service	£ 98		Arts Centres and clubs	£ 5,285
			Education in the arts	£ 144,340
Arts centres and clubs		£ 3,236		
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 3,236		Festivals	£ 35,806
Education in the arts		£ 135,021	Arts Associations	£ 207,254
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 1,350,221		Greater London Arts Association	£ 6,500
			Lincolnshire Association	£ 15,015
Housing in the arts		£ 220,000	Midlands Association for the Arts	£ 21,675
Music	£ 28,000		Northern Arts Association	£ 93,350
Drama	£ 123,900		North West Arts Association	£ 30,900
Art	£ 13,950		Southern Arts Association	£ 6,250
Arts centres	£ 56,150		South Western Arts Association	£ 25,390
			Universities' Arts Trust	£ 4,284
			Yorkshire Arts Association	£ 3,890
			Housing the Arts	£ 355,300
			Music	£ 2,000
			Drama	£ 245,000
			Art	£ 25,250
			Arts centres	£ 83,050
			Schedule 3 total	£ 6,166,833

1970-71			1971-72		
Schedule 3 headings, sub-headings and selected detail			Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings		
		£ 2,885,870			
Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 1,420,000		Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited		£ 1,640,000
Sadler's Wells Trust (Coliseum) Limited	£ 815,000		Sadler's Wells Trust (Coliseum) Limited		£ 1,118,153
National Theatre Board	£ 375,384		National Theatre Board		£ 415,724
Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 275,486		Royal Shakespeare Theatre		£ 295,030
Music		£ 1,262,565	Music		£ 1,517,705
Opera	£ 70,614		Opera	£ 82,245	
Ballet	£ 267,700		Ballet	£ 354,260	
Orchestras	£ 715,900		Orchestras	£ 853,801	
Concerts	£ 121,900		Concerts	£ 131,998	
Festivals	£ 53,048		Festivals	£ 48,400	
Other activities	£ 33,403		Other activities	£ 47,001	
Drama		£ 1,419,538	Drama		£ 1,825,836
List of funded organisations	£ 1,419,538		List of funded organisations	£ 1,825,836	
Art		£ 76,331	Art		£ 112,206
Listed of funded organisations	£ 53,025		Listed of funded organisations	£ 73,277	
Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 8,425		Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 13,134	
Provision of studios	£ 2,300		Works of art for public buildings	£ 1,800	
Awards to Artists	£ 12,581		Provision of studios	£ 6,943	
			Awards to Artists	£ 17,052	
Literature		£ 68,506	Literature		£ 63,792
List of funded organisations	£ 20,571		List of funded organisations	£ 28,067	
Literary Magazines	£ 7,090		Literary Magazines	£ 7,765	
Little presses	£ 2,720		Little presses	£ 2,500	
Grants to writers	£ 33,950		Grants to writers	£ 21,710	
Grants to translators	£ 1,575		Grants to translators	£ 2,750	
Grants to publishers	£ 1,500		Grants to publishers	£ 500	
Grants to poets	£ 1,100		Grants to poets	£ 500	
Festivals			Festivals		£ 52,841
List of supported festivals	£ 42,237		List of supported festivals	£ 52,841	
Arts Associations		£ 317,448	Arts Associations		£ 472,114
Greater London Arts Association	£ 15,238		Eastern Arts Association	£ 13,330	
Lincolnshire Association	£ 18,400		East Midlands Arts Association	£ 16,750	
East Midlands Arts Association	£ 12,050		Greater London Arts Association	£ 38,830	
West Midlands Arts Association	£ 30,150		Lincolnshire Association	£ 23,250	
Northern Arts	£ 115,525		Merseyside Arts Association	£ 22,110	
North West Arts Association	£ 50,350		Mid Pennine Association for the Arts	£ 300	
Southern Arts Association	£ 18,620		Northern Arts	£ 145,857	
South Western Arts Association	£ 41,575		North West Arts Association	£ 63,010	
Yorkshire Arts Association	£ 13,540		Southern Arts Association	£ 35,250	
Universities' Arts Trust	£ 2,000		South Western Arts Association	£ 46,550	
			West Midlands Arts Association	£ 29,450	
Arts Centres and clubs		£ 35,325	Yorkshire Arts Association	£ 37,427	
Arts Council for North Hertfordshire	£ 400				
Arts Council of Waltham Holy Cross	£ 100		Projects, arts Centres and clubs		£ 61,796
Basilidon Arts Society	£ 500		Institute of Contemporary Arts Limited	£ 25,000	
Beccles and District Arts Society	£ 50		Round House Trust Limited	£ 7,500	
Birmingham: Cannon Hill Trust Limited	£ 2,750		Harlow Theatre Arts Trust	£ 4,000	
Folkestone Adult Education Centre	£ 500		Swindon: Wyvern Arts Trust	£ 4,000	
Hastings: Stables Trust Limited	£ 500		Sussex University: Gardner Centre for the Arts	£ 3,450	
Hemel Hempstead Arts Trust	£ 150		Birmingham: Cannon Hill Trust	£ 3,000	
Hertfordshire and Essex Malthouse Trust Limited	£ 850		Liverpool: Great Georges Project	£ 2,500	
King's Lynn: St George's Guildhall Limited	£ 1,500		Birmingham Arts Laboratory	£ 2,000	
London: Institute of Contemporary Arts	£ 25,000		Hertfordshire and Essex Malthouse Trust Limited	£ 1,700	
St Albans and District Arts Council	£ 150		King's Lynn: St George's Guildhall Limited	£ 1,500	
Southend Arts Council	£ 25		Electric Theatre Company	£ 1,200	
Tring Arts Society	£ 100		Folkestone Adult Education Centre	£ 750	
University of Sussex: Gardner Centre for the Arts	£ 2,750		Centreprise	£ 500	
			The Combination Limited	£ 500	
Transport subsidy		£ 4,005	Hastings: Stables Trust Limited	£ 500	
Bury St Edmunds Theatre Management Limited	£ 150		Oxford Community Workshop	£ 500	
Cambridge: Arts Theatre of Cambridge Limited	£ 500		Space Structure Workshop	£ 500	
Canterbury Theatre Trust Limited	£ 800		Arts Council for North Hertfordshire	£ 400	
Colchester Repertory Company Limited	£ 500		Gravesend Arts Council	£ 400	
East Grinstead: Myles Byrne Projects Limited	£ 30		Principal Edwards Magic Theatre	£ 300	
Farnham Repertory Company Limited	£ 150		Victor Corti	£ 300	
Guildford: Yvonne Arnaud Theatre Management Limited	£ 300		Basilidon District Arts Association	£ 250	
Ipswich Arts Theatre Trust	£ 200		Anglian Arts	£ 200	
Leatherhead: Thorndike Theatre (Leatherhead) Limited	£ 250		Transmedia Exploration	£ 200	
Norwich: Theatre Royal (Norwich) Trust Limited	£ 250		Pages	£ 196	
Oxford: Meadow Players Limited	£ 600		Hemel Hempstead Arts Trust	£ 150	
Palace Theatre Trust (Southend and Westcliff) Limited	£ 75		St Albans and District Arts Council	£ 100	
Watford Civic Theatre Trust Limited	£ 200		Waltham Cross Arts Council	£ 100	
			Beccles and District Arts Society	£ 50	
Education in the arts		£ 148,630	Tring Arts Society	£ 50	
Music	£ 124,000				
Drama	£ 20,000		Transport subsidy		£ 2,675
Polytechnic School of Management Studies: Training Course in Arts Administration (Bursaries)	£ 4,630		Canterbury Theatre Trust Limited	£ 800	
			East Grinstead: Myles Byrne Projects Limited	£ 25	
Housing the Arts		£ 442,500	Farnham Repertory Company Limited	£ 150	
Drama	£ 325,000		Guildford: Yvonne Arnaud Theatre Management Limited	£ 300	
Arts Centres	£ 117,500		Leatherhead: Thorndike Theatre (Leatherhead) Limited	£ 300	
			Oxford: Meadow Players Limited	£ 650	
		£ 6,660,718	Oxford University Theatre	£ 450	
			Education in the arts		£ 146,162
			Music	£ 123,990	
			Drama	£ 15,500	
			Polytechnic School of Management Studies: Training Course in Arts Administration (Bursaries)	£ 6,672	
			Housing the Arts		£ 618,000
			Drama	£ 560,000	
			Art	£ 500	
			Arts Centres	£ 57,500	

1972-73			1973-74		
Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings			Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings		
Royal Opera House, Convent Garden Limited		£1,750,000	Royal Opera House, Convent Garden Limited		£ 2,195,000
Sadler's Wells Trust (Coliseum) Limited		£ 935,000	Sadler's Wells Trust (Coliseum) Limited		£ 1,130,000
National Theatre Board		£ 398,637	National Theatre Board		£ 450,534
Royal Shakespeare Theatre		£ 382,000	Royal Shakespeare Theatre		£ 420,000
Music		£1,708,806	Music		£ 1,936,979
Opera	£ 93,780		Opera	£ 145,875	
Dance	£ 392,510		Dance	£ 463,025	
Orchestras	£ 928,930		Orchestras	£ 1,025,637	
Concerts	£ 155,214		Concerts	£ 182,545	
Festivals	£ 52,949		Festivals	£ 46,871	
Other activities	£ 85,423		Other activities	£ 73,026	
Drama		£ 2,268,023	Drama		£ 2,554,373
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 2,251,551		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 2,520,792	
Bursaries	£ 16,472		Bursaries	£ 33,581	
Art		£ 150,055	Art		£ 220,222
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 78,850		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 120,005	
Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 31,645		Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 24,448	
Works of art for public buildings	£ 12,955		Works of art for public buildings	£ 16,700	
Provision of studios	£ 6,335		Provision of studios	£ 11,959	
Awards to artists	£ 20,270		Awards to artists	£ 40,110	
			Capital	£ 7,000	
Literature		£ 78,644	Literature		£ 133,584
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 26,964		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 54,934	
Literary magazines	£ 8,440		Literary Magazines	£ 23,550	
Little presses	£ 3,490		Little Presses	£ 8,550	
Help for writers and publishers	£ 39,750		Help for Writers and Publishers	£ 46,550	
Festivals		£ 52,907	Festivals		£ 69,628
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 52,907		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 69,628	
Arts associations		£ 781,590	Arts Associations		£ 1,416,285
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 781,590		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 1,416,285	
Projects, arts centres and clubs		£ 109,447	Arts Centres and Regional Projects		£ 265,905
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 109,447		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 265,905	
Transport subsidy		£ 3,900	Transport Subsidy		£ 590
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 3,900		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 590	
Education in the arts		£ 146,370	Education in the Arts		£ 136,445
Music	£ 116,250		Music	£ 104,500	
Drama	£ 18,000		Drama	£ 17,500	
Arts administration training (Bursaries)	£ 12,120		Arts administration training (Bursaries)	£ 14,445	
Housing the arts		£ 691,500	Housing the Arts		£ 590,500
Music	£ 40,000		Music	£ 104,300	
Drama	£ 507,750		Drama	£ 262,200	
Art	£ 18,250		Art	£ 41,250	
Arts centres	£ 125,500		Arts Centres	£ 182,750	
Schedule 3 total		£ 9,456,879			
			Schedule 3 total		£ 11,520,045

1974-75			1975-76		
Schedule 3 headings and sub headings			Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings		
National Companies		£ 5,772,750	National companies		£ 8,104,500
Royal Opera House Covent Garden Limited	£ 2,650,000		English National Opera	£ 1,848,000	
English National Opera Limited	£ 1,411,000		National Theatre Board	£ 1,931,500	
National Theatre Board	£ 1,017,500		Royal Opera House Covent Garden Limited	£ 3,410,000	
Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 694,250		Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 915,000	
Music		£ 2,589,127	Music		£ 3,082,222
Opera	£ 230,862		Opera	£ 323,750	
Dance	£ 644,765		Dance	£ 855,000	
Orchestras	£ 1,322,821		Orchestral and other concerts	£ 1,795,540	
Concerts	£ 250,212		Other Activities	£ 107,932	
Festivals	£ 71,113				
Other activities	£ 69,354				
			Drama		£ 4,370,195
Drama		£ 3,288,500	<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 4,335,215	
<i>(list of theatre companies by location)</i>	£ 3,288,500		Bursaries	£ 34,980	
			Touring		£ 1,164,112
Art		£ 360,600	Music	£ 852,677	
<i>list of funded galleries</i>	£ 224,731		Drama	£ 302,215	
<i>list of grants and guarantees for exhibitions</i>	£ 25,965		Theatres	£ 9,220	
works of Art for Public Buildings	£ 12,050				
Provision of Studios	£ 23,594		Art		£ 531,952
Artists in Residence	£ 4,500		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 284,879	
Awards	£ 42,086		Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 40,487	
Capital	£ 6,440		Works of Art for Public Buildings	£ 2,150	
Performance Art	£ 21,234		Provision of studios	£ 39,583	
			Artists in residence	£ 7,500	
Literature		£ 186,548	Awards	£ 91,774	
<i>List of funded clients</i>	£ 77,198		Grants towards gallery improvements	£ 5,926	
Literary Magazines	£ 33,900		Performance art	£ 59,653	
Little Presses	£ 16,850				
Help for Writers and Publishers	£ 58,600		Literature		£ 226,800
			<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 103,300	
Festivals		£ 75,857	Literary magazines	£ 45,550	
<i>List of supported festivals</i>	£ 75,857		Little presses	£ 26,600	
			Grants to publishers	£ 8,190	
Regional Arts Associations		£ 1,746,884	Creative Writing Fellowships	£ 7,560	
<i>List of Associations and activities</i>	£ 1,746,884		Awards	£ 35,600	
Arts Centres and Regional Projects		£ 309,141	Festivals		£ 170,825
<i>List of centres and activities</i>	£ 309,141		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 170,825	
Education in the Arts		£ 202,266	Regional Arts Associations		£ 2,078,967
Music	£ 123,400		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 2,078,967	
Drama	£ 16,100				
Training Schemes	£ 62,766		Arts Centres and Community Projects		£ 581,362
			<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 581,362	
			Education in the Arts		£ 243,852
			Music	£ 153,000	
			Drama	£ 9,500	
			Training schemes	£ 81,352	
			Housing the Arts		£ 787,500
			Music	£ 140,850	
			Drama	£ 446,250	
			Touring	£ 37,500	
			Art	£ 70,100	
			Arts centres	£ 92,800	
Schedule 3 total		£ 14,531,673	Schedule 3 total		£ 21,342,287

1976-77			1977-78		
Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings			Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings		
National Companies		£ 9,967,173	National Companies		£ 11,625,593
English National Opera	£ 2,225,000		English National Opera	£ 2,640,000	
National Theatre Board	£ 2,436,500		National Theatre Board	£ 2,770,593	
Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 4,300,000		Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 4,850,000	
Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 1,005,673		Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 1,365,000	
Music		£ 3,932,455	Music and Dance		£ 4,325,987
Opera	£ 655,400		Opera	£ 550,550	
Dance	£ 1,013,259		Dance and Mime	£ 1,200,094	
Orchestral and other concerts	£ 2,081,385		Awards to Artists	£ 18,380	
Other Activities	£ 182,411		Orchestral and other Concerts	£ 2,357,681	
			Other Activities	£ 199,282	
Drama		£ 5,642,602	Drama		£ 6,049,278
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 5,560,352		Building-based companies		
<i>Bursaries and Supplements</i>	£ 82,250		Touring companies		
			Projects		
Touring		£ 1,444,533	Other subsidies		
Music	£ 1,073,700				£ 1,914,614
Drama	£ 370,833				
			Touring	£ 1,315,000	
Art		£ 620,540	Opera and Dance	£ 481,114	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 376,126		Drama	£ 118,500	
Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 40,870		Touring Theatres		
Works of Art for Public Buildings	£ 16,750				£ 776,385
Provision of Studios	£ 20,030		Art	£ 482,103	
Artists and Photographers in residence	£ 9,760		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 33,516	
Awards and Bursaries	£ 123,429		Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 14,775	
Grants for gallery improvements and equipment	£ 5,810		Works of Art for Public Buildings	£ 37,850	
Grants to publishers	£ 11,675		Art into Landscape	£ 21,233	
Art Magazines	£ 3,300		Provision of Studios	£ 108,108	
Performance Art	£ 12,790		Awards to Artists	£ 17,360	
			Artists in Residence	£ 9,040	
Literature		£ 413,144	Photographers in Residence and Photography Fellowships	£ 8,200	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 119,288		Grants to Publishers	£ 11,120	
Literary Magazines	£ 78,150		Art Magazines	£ 19,550	
Little Presses	£ 33,250		Grants for gallery improvements and equipment	£ 13,530	
Grants to Publishers	£ 50,055		Performance Art		
Creative Writing Fellowships	£ 47,001				£ 438,850
Awards	£ 85,400		Literature	£ 155,100	
			<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 84,300	
Festivals		£ 240,516	Literary Magazines	£ 34,350	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 240,516		Little Presses	£ 15,650	
			Grants to Publishers	£ 63,750	
Regional Arts Associations		£ 3,021,506	Creative Writing Fellowships	£ 85,700	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 3,021,506		Awards		
					£ 230,926
Arts Centres and Community Projects		£ 635,758	Festivals	£ 230,926	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 635,758		<i>List of funded organisations</i>		
					£ 3,916,444
Education in the Arts		£ 318,381	Regional Arts Associations	£ 3,916,444	
Music	£ 167,000		<i>List of funded organisations</i>		
Drama	£ 11,200				£ 741,545
Training Schemes	£ 140,181		Arts Centres and Community Projects	£ 741,545	
			<i>List of funded organisations</i>		
Housing the Arts		£ 905,000			£ 335,323
Music	£ 76,500		Education in the Arts	£ 17,500	
Drama	£ 475,150		Music and Dance	£ 10,800	
Touring	£ 60,000		Drama	£ 154,023	
Art	£ 59,650		Training Schemes		
					£ 388,500
Schedule 3 total		£ 27,141,608	Housing the Arts	£ 53,600	
			Music and Dance	£ 135,000	
			Drama	£ 17,950	
			Touring	£ 32,000	
			Arts Centres and other Projects	£ 149,950	
			Arts Centres and other Projects		
			Schedule 3 total		£ 30,743,445

1978-79			1979-80		
Schedule 3 headings and sub-headings			Schedule 1		
National Companies		£ 14,379,986	National Companies		£ 18,723,500
English National Opera	£ 3,665,000		English National Opera	£ 4,800,000	
National Theatre Board	£ 3,401,500		National Theatre Board	£ 4,806,500	
Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 5,475,000		Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 7,000,000	
Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 1,838,486		Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 2,117,000	
Music and Dance		£ 5,032,746	Music		£ 4,045,749
Opera	£ 513,550		Opera	£ 680,670	
Dance and Mime	£ 1,451,892		Orchestral and other concerts	£ 3,067,909	
Awards to Artists	£ 17,262		Other activities	£ 297,170	
Orchestral and other concerts	£ 2,770,265				
Other Activities	£ 279,777		Dance and Mime		£ 1,729,045
			<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 1,715,290	
Drama		£ 7,360,857	Awards to artists	£ 13,755	
Building-based companies					
Touring companies			Drama		£ 8,317,567
Projects			Building-based companies	£ 6,432,185	
Other Subsidies			Touring Companies	£ 1,434,787	
			Projects	£ 289,992	
Touring		£ 1,984,679	Other Subsidies	£ 160,603	
Opera and Dance	£ 1,446,000				
Drama	£ 518,679		Touring		£ 2,419,187
British Council: Visiting Arts Unit	£ 20,000		Opera and Dance	£ 1,748,229	
			Drama	£ 650,958	
Art		£ 970,184	British Council: Visiting Arts Unit	£ 20,000	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 660,023				
Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 68,049		Art		£ 1,079,784
Works of Art for Public Buildings	£ 27,585		<i>List of galleries</i>	£ 782,132	
Provision of Studios	£ 21,610		Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 63,990	
Awards to Artists	£ 127,446		Works of Art for Public Sites	£ 38,250	
Artists in Residence	£ 8,300		Provision of studios and workshops	£ 15,710	
Grants to Publishers	£ 12,713		Awards to Artists	£ 116,128	
Art Magazines	£ 16,080		Artists in Residence	£ 8,500	
Grants for gallery improvements and equipment	£ 13,713		Grants to publishers	£ 9,005	
Performance Art	£ 12,665		Art Magazines	£ 21,043	
			Grants for gallery improvements and equipment	£ 1,700	
Literature		£ 508,917	performance Art	£ 23,326	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 172,220				
Literary Magazines	£ 144,688		Literature		£ 498,466
Little Presses	£ 33,700		<i>List of funded clients</i>	£ 190,690	
Grants to Publishers	£ 26,600		Literary Magazines	£ 100,000	
Creative Writing Fellowships	£ 54,584		Little Presses	£ 45,770	
Augmentation of Prizes	£ 5,175		Grants to Publishers	£ 28,975	
Awards to writers and translators	£ 71,950		Creative Writing Fellowships	£ 68,936	
			Augmentation of Prizes	£ 4,445	
Festivals		£ 302,288	Awards to writers and translators	£ 59,650	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 302,288				
			Festivals		£ 371,990
Regional Arts Associations		£ 5,202,381	List of festivals receiving funding	£ 371,990	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 5,202,381				
			Regional Arts Associations		£ 6,362,017
Arts Centres and Community Projects		£ 1,038,450	List of Associations	£ 6,362,017	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 1,038,450				
			Arts Centres and Community Projects		£ 1,073,294
Education in the Arts		£ 425,079	<i>Two lists - no heading to distinguish between them</i>	£ 1,073,294	
Music and Dance	£ 237,750				
Drama	£ 12,300		Education in the Arts		£ 476,000
Training Schemes	£ 175,029		Music and Dance	£ 232,000	
			Drama	£ 13,150	
Housing the Arts		£ 1,095,500	Training Schemes	£ 230,850	
Music and Dance	£ 157,450				
Drama	£ 165,500		Housing the Arts		£ 1,474,500
Touring Theatres	£ 592,050		Music and Dance	£ 860,000	
Art	£ 54,500		Drama	£ 295,500	
Regional	£ 126,000		Touring	£ 110,000	
			Art	£ 67,000	
Schedule 3 total		£ 38,301,067	Regional	£ 142,000	
			Schedule 1 total		£ 46,571,099

1980-81			1981-82		
Schedule 1			Schedule 1		
National Companies		£ 21,003,934	National Companies		£ 22,220,000
English National Opera	£ 5,475,000		English National Opera	£ 4,550,000	
National Theatre Board	£ 51,888,000		National Theatre Board	£ 5,770,000	
Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 7,805,000		Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 9,020,000	
Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 2,535,934		Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 2,880,000	
Music		£ 4,445,616	Music		£ 5,306,755
Opera	£ 663,750		Opera	£ 617,000	
Orchestral and other concerts	£ 3,506,793		Orchestral and other concerts	£ 4,055,891	
Other Activities	£ 275,073		Festivals	£ 326,000	
			Other activities	£ 307,864	
Dance and Mime		£ 1,955,434	Dance and Mime		£ 2,424,502
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 1,923,986		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 2,383,232	
Awards to Artists	£ 31,448		Awards to Artists	£ 41,270	
Drama		£ 9,591,121	Drama		£ 10,296,964
Building-based companies	£ 7,360,408		Building-based companies	£ 7,771,586	
Touring companies	£ 1,763,759		Touring companies	£ 1,716,070	
Projects	£ 352,411		Projects	£ 708,143	
Other Subsidies	£ 114,513		Other subsidies	£ 101,165	
Touring		£ 2,733,116	Regional		£ 14,599,218
Opera and Dance	£ 1,972,524		Regional Arts Associationss	£ 8,888,509	
Drama	£ 730,592		Touring	£ 4,637,556	
British Council: Visiting Arts Unit	£ 30,000		Arts Centres and Community Projects	£ 1,073,153	
Art		£ 1,434,336	Visual Arts		£ 1,339,986
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 926,882		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 949,945	
Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 84,085		Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 74,568	
Art in Public Sites	£ 79,150		Art in Public Sites	£ 14,250	
Provision of Studios and Darkrooms	£ 42,300		Provision of Studios and Darkrooms	£ 33,490	
Awards to Artists	£ 114,437		Awards to Artists	£ 51,688	
Art Magazines	£ 42,975		Art Magazines	£ 54,690	
Grant for Publishing	£ 15,280		Grants for Publishing	£ 22,985	
Artists in Residence	£ 12,870		Artists-in-Residence	£ 34,750	
Grants for Gallery Improvements and the Purchase of Equipment	£ 35,227		Incentive Grants	£ 600	
Special Applications/Experimental Projects	£ 81,130		Grants for Gallery Improvements and the Purchase of Equipment	£ 24,770	
			Special Applications/Experimental Projects	£ 78,250	
Literature		£ 637,734	Literature		£ 647,531
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 209,500		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 251,200	
Literary Magazines	£ 164,350		Literary Magazines	£ 157,400	
Little Presses	£ 49,500		Little Presses	£ 61,750	
Grants to Publishers	£ 48,275		Grants to Publishers	£ 80,803	
Creative Writing Fellowships	£ 69,794		Creative Writing Fellowships	£ 38,250	
Augmentation of Prizes	£ 9,690		Augmentation of Prizes	£ 9,378	
Manuscripts	£ 12,475		Manuscripts	£ 7,750	
Awards to writers and translators	£ 74,150		Awards to writers and translators	£ 41,000	
Festivals		£ 389,813	Training		£ 569,504
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 389,813		Music and Dance	£ 177,000	
			Training Schemes	£ 392,504	
Regional Arts Associations		£ 7,686,197	Housing the Arts		£ 2,380,200
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 7,686,197		National Companies	£ 1,325,500	
			Music	£ 38,500	
Arts Centres and Community Projects		£ 1,115,800	Drama	£ 330,000	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 1,115,800		Touring	£ 257,500	
			Art	£ 110,000	
Training in the Arts		£ 537,211	Literature	£ 10,000	
Music and Dance	£ 221,550		Regional	£ 308,700	
Drama	£ 15,300				
Training Schemes	£ 300,361				
Housing the Arts		£ 1,236,800	Schedule 1 total		£ 59,784,660
Music and Dance	£ 355,000				
Drama	£ 172,000				
Touring	£ 527,500				
Art	£ 82,000				
Regional	£ 100,300				
Schedule.1 total		£ 52,767,112			

1982-83			1983-84		
Schedule 1			Schedule 1		
National Companies		£ 26,444,682	National Companies		£ 29,102,935
English National Opera	£ 5,440,000		English National Opera	£ 5,988,401	
National Theatre Board	£ 6,550,000		National Theatre Board	£ 6,869,446	
Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 10,379,682		Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 11,584,776	
Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 7,075,000		Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 4,660,312	
Regional Arts Associations		£ 10,616,783	Regional Arts Associations		£ 11,179,148
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 10,616,783		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 11,174,148	
			Council of Regional Arts Associations	£ 5,000	
Music		£ 6,047,111			
Opera	£ 643,000		Music		£ 6,127,444
Orchestral and other concerts	£ 4,760,482		Opera	£ 704,120	
Festivals	£ 335,637		Orchestral and other concerts	£ 4,809,706	
Other activities	£ 307,992		Festivals	£ 323,368	
			Other Activities	£ 222,179	
Dance and Mime		£ 2,706,741	Recordings	£ 68,071	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 2,643,701				
Awards to Artists	£ 63,040		Dance and Mime		£ 2,868,724
			<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 2,805,734	
Touring		£ 5,390,154	Awards to artists	£ 62,990	
Opera	£ 4,621,009				
Dance	£ 53,000		Touring		£ 5,887,734
Drama	£ 548,645		Opera	£ 5,227,861	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 167,500		Dance	£ 15,750	
			Drama	£ 604,523	
Drama		£ 11,501,929	Visiting Arts Unit of Great Britain	£ 39,600	
Building-based companies	£ 8,953,788				
Touring companies	£ 1,794,172		Drama		£ 11,858,506
Projects	£ 632,724		Building-based companies	£ 9,127,508	
Theatre Writing	£ 79,845		Touring companies	£ 1,914,210	
Other subsidies	£ 41,000		Projects	£ 683,935	
			Theatre Writing Schemes	£ 110,853	
Art		£ 1,428,707	Other Subsidies	£ 22,000	
Visual Arts	£ 1,102,856				
Grant and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 104,090		Art		£ 1,365,043
Grants for gallery improvements and equipment	£ 1,600		Visual Arts	£ 1,023,660	
Artists-in-Residence	£ 22,000		Grants and guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 92,187	
Art in Public Sites	£ 15,375		Grants for gallery improvements	£ 11,000	
Provision of Studios and Darkrooms	£ 17,215		Artists in Residence	£ 14,250	
Incentive Grants	£ 7,500		Art in public sites	£ 13,750	
Art Magazines	£ 60,235		Provision of studios	£ 38,941	
Grants for publishing	£ 25,978		Incentive grants	£ 5,000	
Artists Film and Video	£ 20,443		Art magazines	£ 35,300	
Awards to Film Makers/Video Artists	£ 51,415		Grants for publishing and documentation	£ 5,700	
			Photography commissions	£ 2,000	
Literature		£ 720,433	Photography magazines	£ 38,600	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 256,058		Photography publishing	£ 8,895	
Literary Magazines	£ 184,250		Artists film and video	£ 75,760	
Grants to Publishers	£ 162,665				
Writers' Fellowships	£ 54,045		Literature		£ 825,862
Bookshops and Book Ordering Points	£ 8,170		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 261,239	
Augmentation of Prizes	£ 6,695		Literary magazines	£ 164,150	
Manuscripts	£ 1,550		Grants to publishers	£ 207,628	
Awards to writers and translators	£ 47,000		Writers' Fellowships	£ 111,192	
			Bookshops and book ordering points	£ 10,000	
Arts Centres and Community Projects		£ 1,179,280	Augmentation of Prizes	£ 9,853	
Buckinghamshire Arts Federations	£ 20,400		Manuscripts	£ 3,800	
Arts Centres	£ 802,045		Awards to writers	£ 58,000	
Community Projects	£ 257,665				
Special applications/Experimental projects	£ 69,170		Arts Centres and Community Projects		£ 1,186,456
Carnival	£ 30,000		Buckinghamshire Arts Federation	£ 12,375	
			Arts Centres	£ 793,703	
Training		£ 583,349	Community Arts	£ 275,000	
List of funded organisations	£ 223,791		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 36,630	
Training Schemes	£ 359,558		Special applications	£ 33,550	
			Carnival	£ 35,198	
Housing the Arts		£ 1,612,400			
National Companies	£ 300,100		Training		£ 628,073
Music	£ 322,500		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 229,704	
Dance	£ 1,500		Training schemes	£ 398,835	
Touring	£ 350,000				
Drama	£ 168,300		Housing the Arts		£ 979,000
Art	£ 39,500		National Companies	£ 91,000	
Regional	£ 430,500		Music	£ 83,000	
			Dance	£ 1,500	
Schedule 1 total		£ 68,231,569	Drama	£ 355,500	
			Touring	£ 113,000	
			Art	£ 114,000	
			Regional	£ 221,000	
			Schedule 1 total		£ 72,008,925

1984-85			1985-86		
Schedule 1			Schedule 1		
National Companies		£ 30,597,011	National Companies		£ 31,856,191
English National Opera	£ 5,918,250		English National Opera	£ 6,034,500	
National Theatre Board	£ 7,005,870		National Theatre Board	£ 6,955,200	
Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 12,386,891		Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 13,474,491	
Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 5,286,000		Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 5,392,000	
Regional Arts Associations		£ 12,338,483	Regional Arts Associations		£ 15,963,422
Eastern Arts Association	£ 889,775		Eastern Arts Association	£ 1,144,871	
East Midlands Arts Association	£ 1,061,119		East Midlands Arts Association	£ 1,627,406	
Greater Londer Arts Association	£ 1,583,722		Greater Londer Arts Association	£ 1,791,430	
Lincolnshire and Humberside Arts	£ 591,050		Lincolnshire and Humberside Arts	£ 782,836	
Merseyside Arts	£ 583,903		Merseyside Arts	£ 656,000	
Northern Arts	£ 1,938,659		Northern Arts	£ 2,086,802	
North West Arts	£ 1,031,953		North West Arts	£ 1,493,749	
Southern Arts Association	£ 995,088		Southern Arts Association	£ 1,172,470	
South East Arts Association	£ 628,991		South East Arts Association	£ 1,085,773	
South West Arts Association	£ 970,894		South West Arts Association	£ 1,225,052	
West Midlands Arts	£ 1,221,727		West Midlands Arts	£ 1,558,134	
Yorkshire Arts Association	£ 841,602		Yorkshire Arts Association	£ 1,338,899	
Music		£ 8,687,667	Music		£ 8,153,571
Opera	£ 2,941,200		Opera	£ 2,992,950	
Regional Orchestras & other major music organisations	£ 4,773,716		Regional Orchestras & other major music organisations	£ 4,303,886	
Other Concerts	£ 153,541		Other Concerts	£ 186,361	
Contemporary Music Network	£ 197,942		Contemporary Music Network	£ 182,534	
Festivals	£ 340,550		Festivals	£ 147,500	
Recordings	£ 51,448		Recordings	£ 55,900	
Other Activities	£ 210,780		Other Activities	£ 262,026	
Education	£ 18,490		Music for small groups	£ 22,414	
Dance and Mime		£ 3,050,073	Dance and Mime		£ 3,583,266
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 2,998,477		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 3,553,516	
Dance and Mime Awards	£ 51,596		Dance and Mime Awards	£ 29,750	
Touring		£ 3,837,359	Touring		£ 3,765,303
Opera	£ 3,213,164		Opera	£ 3,070,000	
Dance	£ 48,000		Dance	£ 59,997	
Drama	£ 535,195		Drama	£ 522,806	
Visiting Arts Unit of Great Britain	£ 41,000		Theatre Investment Fund	£ 62,500	
			Visiting Arts	£ 50,000	
Drama		£ 12,406,714	Drama		£ 11,746,495
Building-based companies	£ 9,596,354		Building-based companies	£ 8,989,364	
Touring Companies	£ 1,983,950		Touring Companies	£ 1,759,450	
Projects	£ 680,518		Projects	£ 854,428	
Theatre Writing Schemes	£ 123,892		Theatre Writing Schemes	£ 121,253	
Other Subsidies	£ 22,000		Other Subsidies	£ 22,000	
Art		£ 1,252,500	Art		
Visual Arts	£ 929,500		Visual Arts	£ 909,500	£ 1,362,660
Grants and Guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 65,309		Development strategy clients	£ 197,900	
Artists in residence	£ 18,250		Grants and Guarantees towards exhibitions	£ 79,235	
Art in Public Sites	£ 35,000		Artists in residence	£ 14,975	
Provision of studios	£ 22,500		Art in Public Sites	£ 1,800	
Magazine Distribution service	£ 15,000		Provision of studios	£ 38,600	
Art Magazines	£ 41,400		Art Magazines	£ 42,600	
Photography Commission	£ 1,975		Photography Magazines	£ 63,000	
Photography Magazines	£ 49,600		Photography publishing	£ 15,050	
Photography publishing	£ 4,695				
Photography Research	£ 700				
Artists film and video	£ 68,571		Artists' Film and Video		£ 80,257
Literature		£ 777,471	Literature		£ 472,100
<i>List of funded clients</i>	£ 254,610		<i>List of funded clients</i>	£ 80,257	
Literary Magazines	£ 163,150				
Grants to Publishers	£ 176,100				
Writers' Fellowships	£ 90,203				
Augmentation of prizes	£ 11,108				
Awards to writers	£ 82,300				
Arts Centres and Community Projects		£ 1,243,078	Arts Centres and Community Projects		£ 1,083,075
Arts Centres	£ 861,000		Arts Centres	£ 757,500	
Community Arts	£ 276,373		Community Arts	£ 185,295	
<i>support organisations</i>	£ 30,578		Service organisations	£ 65,280	
Special Applications	£ 39,267		Performance work	£ 37,000	
Carnival	£ 35,860		Carnival	£ 38,000	
Training		£ 656,712	Training		£ 557,232
Benesh Institute of Choreology	£ 75,000		<i>List of funded clients</i>	£ 316,767	
National Opera Studio	£ 153,076		Training Schemes	£ 240,465	
Training Schemes	£ 428,636				
Housing the Arts		£ 1,145,700	Housing the Arts		£ 833,700
National Companies	£ 33,400		Music	£ 197,000	
Music	£ 10,000		Dance	£ 5,000	
Drama	£ 549,500		Drama	£ 270,000	
			Art	£ 176,000	
Touring	£ 52,000		Regional	£ 185,700	
Art	£ 109,000				
Regional	£ 391,800				
Schedule 1 total		£ 75,992,768	Schedule 1 total		£ 79,457,272

1986-87			1987-88		
Schedule 1			Schedule 1		
National Companies		£ 32,005,400	Regional Arts Associations		£ 27,619,188
English National Opera	£ 6,626,000		Basic/Development Grants	£ 27,594,229	
National Theatre Board	£ 7,811,400		Devolved Clients' Accumulated Deficits	£ 24,959	
Royal Opera House, Covent Garden Limited	£ 12,371,000				
Royal Shakespeare Theatre	£ 5,197,000		Arts Centres and Community Projects		£ 917,500
		£ 24,639,399	Arts Centres	£ 738,500	
Regional Arts Associations			Carnival	£ 99,500	
Basic/Development grants	£ 24,552,823		Community Arts	£ 425,000	
Regional plans	£ 4,000		Service Organisation	£ 3,000	
Devolved clients' accumulated deficits	£ 82,576		Performance Art	£ 34,000	
		£ 1,750,100	Dance and Mime		£ 10,236,430
Arts Centres and Community Projects			<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 9,776,250	
Arts Centres	£ 1,361,000		New Dance Projects and Awards	£ 96,350	
Community Arts	£ 1,597,000		Dance of Ethnic Minorities Projects and Awards	£ 119,000	
Other Combined Arts	£ 13,000		Mime Projects and Awards	£ 131,500	
Service Organisations	£ 72,000		Awards to Composers for Dance	£ 21,375	
Performance Work	£ 47,000		Dance and Mime Outreach Projects and Awards	£ 46,715	
Carnival	£ 97,400		Dance and Mime Animateurs - RAAs	£ 45,240	
		£ 4,267,798	Drama		£ 26,553,238
Dance and Mime			National Companies	£ 13,008,400	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 4,042,250		Building-Based Companies	£ 10,188,280	
Dance Projects and Awards	£ 126,350		Touring Companies	£ 2,323,750	
Mime Projects and Awards	£ 6,500		Small Scale Drama	£ 70,560	
Awards to Composers for Dance	£ 20,625		Projects	£ 799,118	
Dance and Mime Outreach Projects and Awards	£ 72,073		Theatre Writing Schemes	£ 163,130	
		£ 14,088,002	Education		£ 291,760
Drama			Carnival	£ 8,000	
Building Based Companies	£ 10,775,100		Drama	£ 44,849	
Touring Companies	£ 2,267,050		Literature	£ 15,000	
Projects	£ 886,428		Music	£ 50,800	
Theatre Writing Schemes	£ 98,881		Photography	£ 41,780	
<i>Busarries, guarantees and awards</i>	£ 60,543		Training	£ 12,010	
		£ 249,044	NFER: Artists in schools projects	£ 6,000	
Education			Regional Education Projects	£ 93,321	
Carnival	£ 7,300		National Association of Arts Centres	£ 20,000	
Performance Art	£ 6,000		Equal Opportunities Initiatives		£ 52,130
Other grants	£ 36,600		Ethnic Minority Arts Revenue Clients	£ 20,500	
Project Grants to RAA	£ 94,771		Projects	£ 23,380	
Music	£ 68,100		Art and Disability Strategic Initiatives	£ 8,250	
Photography	£ 27,850				
Training	£ 8,423		Film, Video and Broadcasting		£ 141,107
		£ 96,432	Awards to Film Makers/Video Artists	£ 78,741	
Film, Video and Broadcasting			Channel Four Open Submissions	£ 108,741	
Awards to Film Makers/Video Artists	£ 58,032		Small Exhibitions	£ 1,000	
Small Exhibitions	£ 2,312		Regional Project Development Fund	£ 20,116	
Placements	£ 5,500		Annual Client	£ 10,000	
Exhibitions/Equipment	£ 28,338		Magazines	£ 1,250	
Magazine	£ 2,250				
		£ 661,500	Housing the Arts		£ 1,310,000
Housing the Arts			Drama	£ 650,000	
Music	£ 53,000		Touring	£ 550,000	
Drama	£ 87,500		Regional	£ 110,000	
Touring	£ 460,000				
Art	£ 5,000		Literature		£ 488,350
Arts Centres	£ 56,000		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 235,000	
		£ 480,550	Literary Magazines	£ 103,250	
Literature			Awards to Writers	£ 15,600	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 222,800		Grants to Publishers	£ 134,500	
Literary Magazines	£ 108,250				
Grants to Publishers	£ 134,500		Marketing Initiatives		£ 65,504
Awards to Writers	£ 15,000		Arts Marketing Scheme (Consultancies)	£ 18,754	
		£ 10,196,559	Marketing Development Course	£ 6,000	
Music			Development Support Programme	£ 40,750	
Opera	£ 2,433,900				
Orchestra	£ 6,417,900		Music		£ 23,708,211
Concerts	£ 314,900		National Companies	£ 13,263,960	
Former clients of the London Orchestral Concerts Board	£ 239,000		Opera	£ 2,471,400	
Festivals	£ 167,500		Orchestras	£ 6,599,500	
Other Activities	£ 421,474		Concerts	£ 359,191	
Opera Projects	£ 5,000		Former clients of the London Orchestral Concerts Board	£ 129,800	
Music for Small Groups	£ 29,290		Festivals	£ 180,100	
Music Projects	£ 58,795		Other Activities	£ 282,760	
Recordings	£ 60,000		Opera Projects	£ 38,000	
Afro-Caribbean/South Asian Music	£ 48,800		Music for Small Groups	£ 27,350	
		£ 7,078,636	Contemporary Music Projects	£ 43,750	
Touring			Early Music Projects	£ 101,900	
Visiting Arts	£ 212,000		Recordings	£ 405,000	
Opera	£ 4,221,500		Afro-Caribbean/South Asian Music	£ 170,000	
Dance	£ 795,500				
Large and Middle Scale Dance	£ 140,786		Touring		£ 7,042,183
Small Scale Dance scheme (to RAAs)	£ 77,000		Receiving Theatres	£ 198,000	
Drama	£ 861,726		Visiting Arts	£ 202,000	
Large Scale Drama Touring Projects	£ 387,500				
Middle Scale	£ 34,500		Opera	£ 4,243,940	
Small Scale	£ 73,124		Dance	£ 811,000	
Small Scale Drama schemes (to RAAs)	£ 275,000		Large and Middle Scale Dance	£ 172,000	
		£ 4,888,669	Drama	£ 1,032,904	
Training			Large Scale Touring Projects	£ 272,000	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 193,000		Middle Scale Touring Projects	£ 110,339	
Regional Training Centres	£ 40,000				
Training Schemes	£ 2,555,669		Training		£ 359,965
		£ 1,981,171	<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 115,000	
Visual Arts			Regional Training Centres	£ 25,000	
Visual Arts	£ 1,036,000		Training Schemes	£ 219,965	
Development Strategy Clients	£ 406,623		Visual Arts		£ 1,831,083
Exhibitions	£ 95,939		Galleries	£ 1,086,700	
Artists in Residence	£ 9,000		Development Strategy Clients	£ 456,500	
Art in Public Sites	£ 220,000		Art Magazines	£ 29,200	
Studies and Research	£ 10,925		Photography Magazines	£ 67,000	
Provision of Studios	£ 55,475		Art Publishing	£ 41,625	
Art Magazines	£ 31,800		Photography Publishing	£ 19,287	
Photography Magazines	£ 65,500		Exhibitions	£ 100,461	
Art Publishing	£ 26,889		Support for Artists	£ 14,010	
Photography Publishing	£ 23,020		Studios and Research	£ 16,300	
		£ 102,383,260			
Schedule 1 total			Schedule 1 total		£ 100,616,649

1989-90			1990-91		
Schedule 1			Schedule 1		
Dance		£ 12,244,467	Dance		£ 15,102,043
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 11,500,300		National clients	£ 7,905,000	
Great Britain Touring Panel	£ 170,270		Revenue clients	£ 5,114,510	
New Dance	£ 200,855		Annual clients	£ 901,550	
Cultural Diversity Dance Projects	£ 171,716		Management placement scheme	£ 34,145	
Composers for Dance Awards	£ 27,520		Dance projects	£ 589,560	
Dance and Education Outreach Projects	£ 88,180		Composers for dance awards	£ 33,390	
Dance Development Pool	£ 20,015		Dance education and outreach	£ 63,783	
Dance Blueprint	£ 65,611		Regional dance agencies	£ 150,000	
			Phoenix dance company	£ 25,000	
Drama		£ 29,058,724	Cultural exchange	£ 20,000	
National Companies	£ 13,506,100		Cultural diversity	£ 15,175	
Building-based Companies	£ 10,661,505		Promoters' Research and Development	£ 7,370	
Touring	£ 3,072,490		New initiatives	£ 63,010	
Drama Projects	£ 912,127		Great Britain touring fund	£ 179,570	
Small Scale Drama Touring	£ 123,760				£ 31,757,364
Mime Projects	£ 205,470		Drama		
Drama Education	£ 9,003		National companies	£ 14,993,000	
Commission or Option Awards	£ 78,272		Revenue clients	£ 10,444,600	
Royalty Supplement Grants	£ 19,440		Annual clients	£ 2,869,600	
Bursaries	£ 44,205		Three year franchise clients (touring)	£ 1,810,500	
Resident Dramatist Attachment Awards	£ 66,245		Drama and mime projects	£ 1,194,357	
Theatre for Young People Commission Bonus Scheme	£ 11,165		Small-scale touring	£ 113,830	
Writers' Workshops	£ 12,692		Theatre writing	£ 224,878	
Second Production Awards	£ 24,135		Drama education	£ 19,799	
John Whiting Award	£ 4,000		Great Britain Touring Fund: Middle-scale touring	£ 86,800	
Middle-Touring Fund	£ 154,860				
Small-Scale Touring Fund	£ 28,255		Film, Video and Broadcasting Department		£ 199,994
Theatre Investment Fund	£ 125,000		Annual clients	£ 54,400	
		£ 161,330	Regional project development fund	£ 51,560	
Film, Video and Broadcasting Department			Film and video Award	£ 54,519	
Annual Clients	£ 54,430		Venue based commission	£ 40,515	
Awards to Film Makers/Video Artists	£ 50,400				
Venue Based Commissions	£ 28,930		International Initiatives	£ 252,190	
Regional Project Development Fund	£ 27,570		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 252,190	
		£ 648,745	Literature		£ 879,123
International Initiatives			Revenue clients	£ 374,280	
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 648,745		Annual clients	£ 86,630	
Literature		£ 621,003	Bursaries	£ 72,000	
Revenue Clients	£ 299,200		Client development	£ 12,650	
Annual Clients	£ 85,150		Community publishing prize	£ 3,035	
Bursaries	£ 25,100		Cultural diversity fund	£ 44,238	
Book Trust	£ 50,030		Disability projects	£ 10,000	
Cultural Diversity Fund	£ 37,965		Grants to writers	£ 24,035	
Translations	£ 35,118		Literature and broadcasting	£ 6,000	
Client Self-Sufficiency	£ 19,100		Small presses	£ 80,520	
Education	£ 20,060		Translation	£ 53,445	
Touring Central Service	£ 510		Unsolicited approaches	£ 84,000	
Unallocated	£ 48,770		Writers and prisons	£ 6,000	
		£ 154,981	Work with schools	£ 22,290	
Marketing and Resources			Marketing and Resources Department		£ 2,780
OAL Marketing Consultancy Scheme	£ 104,763		Marketing initiatives	£ 2,780	
OAL Grouped Marketing Services Scheme	£ 43,188				
Output Indicators	£ 2,515		Multi-Disciplinary Arts and Arts Centres		£ 12,115,225
Development Support Programme	£ 4,515		Revenue clients	£ 12,025,500	
		£ 11,226,857	Multi-disciplinary ethnic minority arts magazines	£ 33,100	
Multi-Disciplinary Arts and Arts Centres			Carnival bands	£ 56,625	
Revenue Clients	£ 11,135,800				
Carnival Bands	£ 50,037		Music		£ 27,570,163
Ethnic Minority Arts Magazine	£ 20,020		National clients	£ 16,094,000	
Other	£ 21,000		Revenue clients	£ 10,231,720	
		£ 24,583,975	Annual clients	£ 491,936	
Music			Opera projects	£ 38,000	
National Companies	£ 13,357,000		Music for small groups	£ 29,000	
Opera	£ 2,802,250		Early music concert	£ 121,000	
Orchestras	£ 6,954,130		Improvised music touring	£ 21,000	
Concerts	£ 494,660		Recordings	£ 104,218	
Festivals	£ 187,670		Commissions and bursaries	£ 161,099	
Great Britain Touring Fund	£ 19,570		Animaterus and education	£ 77,430	
Other Activities	£ 347,625		African/asian music	£ 73,750	
Opera Projects	£ 31,010		Orchestral developments in the eastern region	£ 74,300	
Music for Small Groups	£ 30,195		General projects	£ 7,710	
Early Music Concert	£ 117,295		Opera/music theatre	£ 45,000	
African Caribbean/South Asian Music	£ 124,735				
Improvised Music Touring	£ 20,145		Personnel and Training Department		£ 563,889
Recordings	£ 97,690		Annual clients	£ 100,000	
		£ 489,040	Regional training centres	£ 50,400	
Personnel and Training			Individual Bursaries	£ 92,226	
Annual Clients	£ 133,090		Traineeships	£ 131,176	
Training Schemes	£ 232,855		Management development initiatives	£ 28,000	
Training Projects	£ 123,095		Training projects	£ 162,087	
		£ 352,795	Planning and Development Department		£ 545,849
Planning and Development			Arts access - revenue client	£ 55,000	
Equal Opportunities Grants Revenue Client	£ 50,730		Arts access - arts and disability strategic initiatives	£ 42,379	
Cultural Diversity Strategic Initiatives	£ 15,567		Arts access - cultural diversity strategic initiatives	£ 15,792	
			Arts access - women in the arts strategic initiatives	£ 8,164	
Arts and Disability Strategic Initiatives	£ 8,010		Building for the arts feasibility studies	£ 100,500	
Research	£ 33,315		Education projects	£ 101,939	
Strategic Initiatives	£ 7,675		Education - regional programmes	£ 200,000	
National Youth Companies	£ 12,000		Research	£ 8,325	
Education Projects: Central Allocation	£ 43,878		Departmental initiatives	£ 14,200	
Regional Education Projects	£ 155,220				
Dance	£ 660				
Music	£ 25,740				
		£ 30,286,915	Regional Arts Associatons		£ 32,410,708
Regional Arts Associations			Basic grants	£ 32,964,000	
Basic Grants	£ 29,963,039		Cultural diversity fund, capital allocation	£ 267,000	
Devolutions	£ 142,576		Reform implementation costs	£ 171,708	
RAA Contingencies	£ 181,300		Regional contingency	£ 8,000	
		£ 8,578,957	Touring		£ 8,355,862
Touring			Receiving Theatres	£ 66,090	
Receiving Theatres	£ 66,090		Visiting Arts	£ 188,230	
Visiting Arts	£ 188,230		Opera	£ 4,671,090	
Opera	£ 4,671,090		Dance	£ 1,046,245	
Dance	£ 1,046,245		Drama	£ 813,210	
Drama	£ 813,210		Large Scale Drama	£ 272,440	
Large Scale Drama	£ 272,440		Middle Scale Drama	£ 147,620	
Middle Scale Drama	£ 147,620		Operetta	£ 60,000	
Operetta	£ 60,000		Opera Touring Fund	£ 285,020	
Opera Touring Fund	£ 285,020		Dance Touring Fund	£ 185,120	
Dance Touring Fund	£ 185,120		Orchestral Touring	£ 254,749	
Orchestral Touring	£ 254,749		Drama Touring Fund	£ 499,153	
Drama Touring Fund	£ 499,153				
		£ 2,531,899	Visual Arts		
Visual Arts			Revenue Clients	£ 1,213,510	
Revenue Clients	£ 1,213,510		Gallery Development Strategy	£ 580,900	
Gallery Development Strategy	£ 580,900		Annual Clients (Magazines)	£ 90,110	
Annual Clients (Magazines)	£ 90,110		Exhibitions	£ 106,303	
Exhibitions	£ 106,303		Magazines	£ 87,355	
Magazines	£ 87,355		Publications	£ 115,524	
Publications	£ 115,524		Patronage and Promotion	£ 29,550	
Patronage and Promotion	£ 29,550		Disability	£ 2,350	
Disability	£ 2,350		Performance Art	£ 33,600	
Performance Art	£ 33,600		Live Art Education	£ 8,060	
Live Art Education	£ 8,060		Strategic Initiative	£ 21,530	
Strategic Initiative	£ 21,530		Education	£ 12,008	
Education	£ 12,008		Contingencies	£ 10,000	
Contingencies	£ 10,000		Great Britain Touring Fund: Black Visual Arts Exhibition Franchises	£ 72,736	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Black Visual Arts Exhibition Franchises	£ 72,736		Development Grants for Touring Exhibitions	£ 42,235	
Development Grants for Touring Exhibitions	£ 42,235		Photography Touring Exhibition Franchises	£ 65,659	
Photography Touring Exhibition Franchises	£ 65,659		Photography Publishing	£ 54,492	
Photography Publishing	£ 54,492		Photography: Research, Information and Debate	£ 11,502	
Photography: Research, Information and Debate	£ 11,502		Photography: Education	£ 29,080	
Photography: Education	£ 29,080		Photography: Cultural Diversity	£ 22,000	
Photography: Cultural Diversity	£ 22,000		Henry Moore Foundation Fellowships	£ 28,395	
Henry Moore Foundation Fellowships	£ 28,395				
			Schedule 1 total		£ 133,607,851

1991-92					
Schedule 1					
Dance		£ 18,235,905	Personnel and Training Department		£ 640,429
National Clients	£ 10,051,150		Annual Clients	£ 99,500	
Revenue Clients	£ 5,925,150		Regional Training Centres	£ 54,600	
Annual Clients	£ 1,163,500		Regional Training Centres Development	£ 10,450	
Regional Dance Agencies	£ 169,000		Individual Bursaries	£ 85,550	
Management Placement Schemes	£ 104,605		Traineeships	£ 221,659	
Dance Projects	£ 490,150		Management Development Initiatives	£ 64,500	
Awards to Composers	£ 20,000		Training Projects	£ 104,170	
Outreach Projects and Awards	£ 49,000				
Phoenix Dance Company	£ 32,400		Planing and Development		£ 318,673
Promoters Research and Development	£ 31,000		Arts Access - Revenue Client	£ 59,500	
New Initiatives	£ 60,100		Arts Access - Arts and Disability Strategic Initiatives	£ 18,589	
Great Britain Touring Fund	£ 140,000		Arts Access - Cultural Diversity Strategic Initiatives	£ 22,454	
			Arts Access - Women in the Arts Strategic Initiatives	£ 1,765	
Drama		£ 36,021,812	Building for the Arts	£ 60,000	
National Companies	£ 17,720,000		Departmental Initiatives	£ 10,500	
Revenue clients	£ 11,322,000		Education	£ 29,670	
Annual clients	£ 3,137,700		Arts in Prisons	£ 2,250	
Three year franchise clients (touring)	£ 2,052,000		Research Projects	£ 38,945	
Drama and Mime projects	£ 1,238,676		Youth Companies	£ 75,000	
Small-Scale Touring	£ 158,452				
Special Initiatives	£ 44,000		Regional Arts Associations and Boards		£ 37,031,188
Playwrights Organisations	£ 30,000		Basic Grants	£ 35,465,088	
Commission or Option Awards	£ 69,684		Reform Implementation Costs	£ 1,540,100	
Royalty Supplement Grants	£ 6,500		Regional Contingency	£ 26,000	
Bursaries	£ 34,000				
Resident Dramatist Attachment Award	£ 59,500		Touring		£ 8,844,561
Writers' Workshops	£ 10,222		Revenue Clients	£ 4,535,000	
Second Production Awards	£ 48,000		Annual Clients	£ 2,266,643	
Theatre Translators Scheme	£ 12,000		Dance Projects	£ 49,000	
John Whiting Award	£ 4,018		Development Pool	£ 18,000	
Drama Education	£ 17,060		Drama Projects: Large Scale	£ 376,600	
Middle-Scale Touring	£ 58,000		Drama Projects: Middle Scale	£ 197,200	
			Opera Projects	£ 66,000	
Film, Video and Broadcasting Department		£ 191,529	Operetta/Musicals	£ 50,000	
Annual Clients	£ 12,000		Venue Development	£ 30,075	
Film and Video Awards	£ 108,909		General Projects	£ 191,500	
Film and Video Venue-Based Commissioning	£ 27,620		Marketing Initiatives	£ 156,515	
Great Britain Touring Fund	£ 43,000		Dance Touring	£ 169,519	
			Drama Touring	£ 289,900	
Internation Initiatives Fund		£ 278,750	Opera Touring	£ 180,000	
List of funded organisations	£ 278,750		Orchestral Touring	£ 268,618	
Literature		£ 1,153,736	Visual Arts Department		£ 3,566,150
Revenue Clients	£ 400,100		Revenue Clients	£ 1,697,950	
Annual Clients	£ 104,425		Annual Clients	£ 198,400	
Bursaries	£ 72,000		Art Development Strategy Clients	£ 588,000	
Client Development	£ 32,800		Black Visual Arts Exhibition Franchises	£ 74,790	
Community Publishing Prize	£ 3,047		Exhibitions	£ 157,940	
Cultural Diversity Fund	£ 56,118		Visual Arts Magazines	£ 134,590	
Disability Projects	£ 27,182		Percent for Art/Research/Conference	£ 66,485	
Grants to Writers	£ 15,000		Visual Arts Publications Franchises	£ 45,783	
Libraries	£ 9,500		Photography Publications	£ 72,525	
Small Presses	£ 63,500		Performance Art	£ 55,000	
Translations	£ 84,740		Great Britain Touring - Touring Exhibition Development Grar	£ 73,850	
Work with Schools	£ 24,500		Great Britain Touring - Photography Touring Franchises	£ 143,977	
Writers and Audiences	£ 12,146		Strategic Initiatives - Visual Arts	£ 104,690	
Writers and Prisons	£ 38,500		Strategic Initiatives - Cultural Diversity	£ 5,000	
General Literature Projects	£ 209,587		Strategic Initiatives - Visual Arts Education	£ 35,340	
Great Britain Touring Fund	£ 600		Strategic Initiatives - Photography Cultural Diversity	£ 26,900	
			Strategic Initiatives - Photography Education	£ 43,750	
Marketing and Resources Department		£ 650	Strategic Initiatives - Photography	£ 27,500	
Richard Clarke	£ 650		Strategic Initiatives - Performance Art	£ 13,700	
Multi-Disciplinary Arts and Arts Centres		£ 13,171,435	Schedule 1 total		£ 112,287,991
Revenue Clients	£ 12,834,600				
Inter-Disciplinary Work	£ 240,315				
Multi-Disciplinary Magazines	£ 25,000				
Multi-Disciplinary Unallocated	£ 1,400				
Notting Hill Carnival Bands	£ 70,120				
Music		£ 43,234,174			
National Clients	£ 28,981,500				
Revenue Clients	£ 12,565,010				
Annual Clients	£ 368,080				
Animateurs and Educations	£ 79,750				
Awards to Trainee Conductors	£ 20,000				
Commissions	£ 195,915				
Composers' Bursaries	£ 31,000				
Composers in Association	£ 20,000				
Early Music Projects	£ 115,085				
Electro-Acoustic Bursaries	£ 21,400				
Improvised Music Touring	£ 21,000				
Jazz Bursaires	£ 21,400				
London Based Chamber Orchestra	£ 82,588				
Music for Small Groups	£ 50,180				
Non-Western Music Projects	£ 72,773				
Opera Commission	£ 50,000				
Opera Development	£ 93,000				
Opera/Music Theatre Projects	£ 45,000				
Orchestral Developments in the Eastern Region	£ 75,000				
Recordings	£ 189,040				
General Projects	£ 106,453				
Great Britain Touring Fund	£ 30,000				

1992-93					
Schedule 1					
Architecture Unit		£ 150,227	Literature		£ 1,472,974
Projects	£ 150,227		Revenue Clients	£ 530,443	
			Annual Clients	£ 119,625	
Combined Arts		£ 14,702,863	Literature and Broadcasting	£ 147,055	
Revenue Clients	£ 13,891,200		Bursaries	£ 72,000	
Annual Clients	£ 65,000		Cultural Diversity	£ 29,450	
Building for the Arts	£ 59,410		Client Development	£ 16,500	
Live Art	£ 45,218		Disability Projects	£ 25,000	
Multi and Inter-Disciplinary Fund	£ 200,000		Education	£ 34,900	
Notting Hill Carnival Bands	£ 98,000		Grants to Writers	£ 19,500	
Multi-Disciplinary Unallocated	£ 19,000		Libraries	£ 48,550	
Youth Arts Fund	£ 239,000		Libretti Fund	£ 11,500	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Live Art Listings	£ 10,000		Literature Development Woreks	£ 85,000	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Other Projects	£ 11,365		Small Press Scheme	£ 65,500	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Live Art Commissions	£ 12,370		Translation Fund	£ 145,451	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Small Scale Touring	£ 18,300		Writers and Prisons	£ 35,000	
			General Project Fund	£ 37,100	
New Collaborations Fund		£ 385,422	Great Britain Touring Fund	£ 50,400	
List of funded organisations	£ 385,422				
Cities of Culture/Arts 2000		£ 250,000	Music		£ 36,027,039
Dance 4	£ 250,000		National Clients	£ 19,701,867	
			Revenue Clients	£ 14,269,439	
Cross Disciplinary Initiatives		£ 355,553	Annual Clients	£ 456,640	
Cultural Diversity - Revenue Client	£ 96,000		Animateurs/Education	£ 49,964	
Cultural Diversity - American Connections	£ 12,442		Composers in Associations	£ 18,000	
Cultural Diversity - Chinese Arts	£ 12,000		Composer's Bursaries	£ 20,000	
Cultural Diversity - Consolidating Black Arts	£ 10,060		Music and Disability	£ 50,500	
Cultural Diversity - European Connections	£ 9,626		Electro-Acoustic Bursaries	£ 20,200	
Cultural Diversity - Strategic Initiatives	£ 13,105		Early Music Projects	£ 45,900	
Arts and Disability - Strategic Initiatives	£ 81,170		Eastern Region Developments	£ 66,000	
Education - Strategic Initiatives	£ 77,000		Improvised Music Touring	£ 25,484	
Policy and Planning - Women in the Arts	£ 550		Jazz Bursaries	£ 25,000	
Policy and Planning - General Projects	£ 43,600		London Based Chamber Orchestras	£ 87,786	
			Music Commissions	£ 160,000	
Dance		£ 20,359,320	Non-Western Music	£ 78,800	
National Clients	£ 10,621,050		Opera Commissions/Development/Projects	£ 274,920	
Revenue Clients	£ 6,697,185		Period Instrument Ensembles	£ 189,770	
Annual and Franchise Clients	£ 1,124,152		Recording	£ 180,824	
National Dance Agencies	£ 330,100		Music for Small Groups	£ 69,335	
National Dance Agencies' Development	£ 133,350		Awards to Trainee Conductors	£ 20,000	
Awards to Composers	£ 46,700		General Projects	£ 137,610	
Black Dance Development	£ 33,000		Great Britain Touring Fund	£ 79,000	
Independent Dance Projects	£ 928,150				£ 10,816,579
Management Placement Scheme	£ 48,183		Touring		
New Writers for Dance	£ 4,000		Revenue Clients	£ 4,840,000	
Education and Outreach Projects	£ 22,000		Annual Clients	£ 3,189,940	
Training Projects and Promoters' Research and Development	£ 80,310		Dance Projects	£ 41,400	
Great Britain Touring Fund - Clients	£ 170,000		International Projects	£ 85,000	
Great Britain Touring Fund - Infrastructure Grants	£ 86,140		Drama Projects	£ 590,099	
Great Britain Touring Fund - Independent Projects	£ 35,000		Marketing	£ 67,360	
			Opera Projects	£ 9,000	
Drama		£ 39,706,365	Visiting Arts	£ 170,000	
National Companies	£ 19,158,500		Venue Development	£ 17,700	
Revenue Clients	£ 13,186,448		Great Britain Touring Fund - Dance Clients/Projects	£ 369,200	
Three Year Franchise Companies (Touring)	£ 2,817,500		Great Britain Touring Fund - Drama Clients/Projects	£ 302,700	
Annual Clients	£ 2,091,000		Great Britain Touring Fund - International Projects	£ 71,500	
Drama Education Projects	£ 14,440		Great Britain Touring Fund - Opera Clients/Projects	£ 483,000	
Drama Disability Projects	£ 10,600		Great Britain Touring Fund - Promoter Developmen	£ 10,470	
Drama and Mime Projects	£ 1,571,158		Great Britain Touring Fund - Orchestral Touring	£ 312,970	
Be Bold Scheme	£ 160,000		Great Britain Touring Fund - Venue Development	£ 256,240	
Special Initiatives	£ 85,490				£ 645,255
Small Scale Touring	£ 134,313		Training		
Playwrights' Organisations	£ 32,150		Annual Clients	£ 170,000	
Working with a Writer	£ 19,650		Individual Bursaries	£ 72,615	
Resident Dramatist Attachment	£ 84,000		Rab Development	£ 64,100	
Bursaries	£ 56,000		Research and Management Development Projects	£ 25,000	
Commision of Option Awards	£ 60,797		Special Initiatives	£ 96,500	
Second Production Awards	£ 21,000		Traineeships	£ 217,040	
Writers' Workshops	£ 11,403				£ 3,735,877
Theatre Translators' Scheme	£ 6,900		Visual Arts		
John Whiting Award	£ 6,024		Revenue Clients	£ 1,808,750	
Other	£ 1,322		Annual Clients	£ 397,750	
Great Britain Touring Fund - Larger Casts	£ 20,725		Arts Development Strategy Clients	£ 97,000	
Great Britain Touring Fund - Middle Scale Touring	£ 65,000		Iniva Franchise	£ 180,000	
Great Britain Touring - New Writing	£ 61,500		Black Visual Arts Exhibitions Franchise	£ 9,500	
Great Britain Touring Fund - Venue Manager Development	£ 30,445		Environmental Projects	£ 2,000	
			Exhibitions and Events	£ 206,470	
Film, Video and Broadcasting		£ 402,791	Magazines	£ 139,000	
Annual Clients	£ 12,420		Photography Publications	£ 81,662	
Small Awards	£ 29,998		Visual Arts Publications	£ 48,000	
Large Awards	£ 50,016		Research and Conferences	£ 31,000	
Artists' Film and Video Initiatives Fund	£ 66,283		Disability Projects	£ 3,000	
Artists' Film and Video Touring Initiatives	£ 121,774		Strategic Initiatives - Interactive Multimedia	£ 5,000	
Great Britain Touring Fund	£ 122,300		Strategic Initiatives - Photography Education	£ 41,595	
			Strategic Initiatives - Photography General	£ 50,000	
			Strategic Initiatives - Public Art Posts	£ 23,000	
International Initiatives Fund		£ 497,980	Strategic Initiatives - Production and Studio	£ 5,000	
List of funded organisations	£ 497,980		Strategic Initiatives - Visual Arts General	£ 37,420	
			Strategic Initiatives - Visual Arts Education	£ 22,750	
			Great Britain Touring Fund - Gallery Improvement	£ 312,055	
			Great Britain Touring Fund - Travel Grants	£ 36,684	
			Great Britain Touring Fund - National Collections	£ 20,000	
			Great Britain Touring Fund - Photography Exhibition	£ 101,320	
			Great Britain Touring Fund - Exhibition Developmen	£ 77,011	
			Schedule 1 total		£ 76,810,521

1993-94					
Schedule 1					
Architecture		£ 237,275	Music		£ 37,303,223
Projects	£ 237,275		National clients	£ 20,236,000	
			Revenue clients	£ 14,749,900	
Arts 2000/Cities of Culture		£ 270,000	Annual clients	£ 630,100	
Manchester City of Drama	£ 270,000		Franchise clients	£ 133,000	
			Music and Disability	£ 33,050	
Combined Arts		£ 15,704,791	Early Music Projects	£ 73,887	
Revenue clients	£ 14,285,100		EOB Replacement Fund	£ 75,000	
Annual and Franchise Clients	£ 249,600		Improvised Music Touring	£ 24,045	
Building for the Arts	£ 130,270		London-based chamber orchestras	£ 90,000	
Franchise Development Fund	£ 33,430		Music commissions	£ 250,827	
Live Art	£ 50,000		Non-Western music	£ 109,471	
New Collaborations	£ 400,867		Opera/music theatre development	£ 178,100	
Notting Hill Carnival Bands	£ 97,090		Period instrument development and touring	£ 159,095	
National Review of Live Art	£ 75,000		Artist Research and Development Fund	£ 134,013	
Multi-disciplinary - unallocated	£ 19,485		Recordings	£ 109,670	
Youth Arts Fund - umbrella organisations	£ 200,000		Strategic Research and Project Fund	£ 124,025	
Youth Arts Fund - Positive Action Scheme	£ 13,610		Training	£ 19,750	
Youth Arts Fund - Make a Difference Scheme	£ 40,000		Great Britain Touring Fund - general	£ 50,000	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Cultural Diversity	£ 35,000		Great Britain Touring Fund - folk/roots tours	£ 11,000	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Live Art Development	£ 20,000		Great Britain Touring Fund - jazz tours	£ 39,000	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Live Art Commissions	£ 35,000		Great Britain Touring Fund - small scale opera touring	£ 48,440	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Travel and Research Fund	£ 10,340		Great Britain Touring Fund - small scale orchestral tour	£ 24,850	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Small Scale Projects	£ 9,999				
			Policy and Planning		£ 158,100
Cross-Disciplinary Initiatives		£ 484,530	General project	£ 158,100	
Arts and Disability - annual clients	£ 90,000				
Arts and Disability - general projects	£ 20,200		Touring		£ 10,548,782
Cultural Diversity - revenue client	£ 130,060		Revenue clients	£ 4,979,800	
Cultural Diversity - European development	£ 11,350		Annual clients	£ 2,181,380	
Cultural Diversity - intercontinental development	£ 9,092		Dance projects	£ 270,500	
Cultural Diversity - national development	£ 50,553		Drama projects	£ 1,202,859	
Cultural Diversity - strategic initiatives	£ 12,575		International projects	£ 193,617	
Education - general projects	£ 100,000		Marketing subsidy commitments	£ 96,500	
Women in the Arts - action planning	£ 4,000		Opera/music theatre projects	£ 348,453	
Women in the Arts - equal opportunities monitoring	£ 2,000		Venue/promoter development	£ 59,200	
Women in the Arts - national networks	£ 13,500		Great Britain Touring Fund: dance projects	£ 139,350	
Women in the Arts - strategic initiatives	£ 41,200		Great Britain Touring Fund: drama projects	£ 305,000	
			Great Britain Touring Fund: opera projects	£ 341,500	
Dance		£ 40,650,488	Great Britain Touring Fund: international projects	£ 57,889	
National Clients	£ 10,940,000		Great Britain Touring Fund: music projects	£ 7,000	
Revenue clients	£ 6,963,000		Great Britain Touring Fund: opera/music theatre projects	£ 109,780	
Annual and franchise clients	£ 1,311,500		Great Britain Touring Fund: orchestral touring	£ 82,470	
National dance agencies	£ 469,750		Great Britain Touring Fund: venue/promoter development	£ 173,484	
Black dance development	£ 46,000				
Composers for dance	£ 24,000		Training		£ 629,584
Independent projects	£ 753,700		Annual Clients	£ 184,500	
Management Placement Scheme	£ 48,380		RAB development	£ 32,300	
Education and Outreach	£ 41,850		Research projects	£ 59,000	
Training	£ 77,225		Traineeships	£ 182,900	
Drama special initiatives	£ 79,000		One-year projects	£ 119,970	
Theatre writing - resident dramatist attachments	£ 76,000		Two-year projects	£ 22,500	
Theatre writing - bursaries	£ 68,000		Three-year projects	£ 28,414	
Theatre writing - Commission or Option Awards	£ 94,758				
Theatre writing - Theatre Translators' Scheme	£ 11,475		Visual Arts		£ 3,880,442
Theatre writing - John Whiting Award	£ 6,000		Revenue clients	£ 1,906,500	
Theatre writing - other	£ 1,530		Annual clients	£ 323,000	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Middle scale touring	£ 142,000		inIVA development	£ 228,920	
Great Britain Touring Fund: Venue manager development	£ 18,798		Art Development Strategy	£ 164,470	
			Black exhibition franchise	£ 19,000	
External Relations		£ 12,250	Disability projects	£ 3,500	
General projects	£ 12,250		Visual arts education	£ 70,000	
			Exhibitions and events	£ 209,210	
Film, Video and Broadcasting		£ 337,199	Interactive multimedia	£ 3,990	
Annual clients	£ 12,800		Magazines	£ 125,000	
Small Awards	£ 28,678		Art Development Fund	£ 36,642	
Large Awards	£ 69,663		Photography education	£ 54,781	
Artists' Film and Video Initiatives Fund	£ 53,630		Public art posts and initiatives	£ 13,000	
Artists' Film and Video Touring Initiatives	£ 97,828		Photography publications	£ 116,924	
Great Britain Touring Fund: general	£ 74,600		Production and Studios	£ 5,200	
			Photography strategic initiatives	£ 100,000	
International Initiatives Fund		£ 509,788	Visual arts publications	£ 42,832	
List of funded organisations	£ 509,788		Visual arts strategic initiatives	£ 52,748	
			Great Britain Touring Fund: international travel and research	£ 45,645	
Literature		£ 1,488,574	Great Britain Touring Fund: National Collections Touring	£ 68,600	
Revenue clients	£ 561,400		Great Britain Touring Fund: photography centres	£ 41,200	
Annual clients	£ 122,050		Great Britain Touring Fund: photography touring and exhibitions	£ 112,717	
Bursaries	£ 112,000		Great Britain Touring Fund: touring exhibition development	£ 79,853	
Cultural Diversity	£ 11,710		Great Britain Touring Fund: venue development and pilot projects	£ 56,710	
Disability projects	£ 19,300				
Education	£ 2,427		Schedule 1 total		£ 59,694,895
Libraries	£ 54,712				
Libretti	£ 12,000				
Literature Development Workers	£ 104,317				
Magazine Development	£ 59,720				
Poetry Initiatives	£ 57,639				
Small Presses	£ 7,237				
Translations	£ 151,325				
General Project Fund	£ 34,450				
Writers and Prisons	£ 44,000				
Great Britain Touring Fund - Residency	£ 32,950				
Great Britain Touring Fund - Regional Touring Network	£ 28,615				
Great Britain Touring Fund - Touring Co-ordination	£ 11,250				
Great Britain Touring Fund - Writers on Tour	£ 1,472				

1994-95					
Schedule 1					
Architecture		£ 157,680	Music		£ 36,130,435
Projects	£ 157,680		National Organisations	£ 20,236,000	
			Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 14,594,500	
Arts 2000		£ 275,000	Fixed term Funded Organisations	£ 118,000	
Swansea City of Literature 1995	£ 275,000		African, Caribbean and Asian Music	£ 110,060	
			Artist Research and Development Fund	£ 131,931	
Combined Arts		£ 15,360,377	Early Music Projects	£ 75,886	
Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 14,145,400		EOB Replacement Fund	£ 75,000	
Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 214,000		Improvised Music Touring	£ 28,000	
Building for the Arts	£ 72,043		London-based Chamber Orchestras	£ 90,000	
Live Art Commissions	£ 80,128		Music and Disability	£ 30,000	
Live Art in Higher Education	£ 25,000		Music Commissions	£ 91,200	
Live Art Publications	£ 56,597		Opera/Music Theatre Development	£ 144,000	
Live Art Travel and Research	£ 13,323		Period Instrument Ensembles	£ 116,500	
Live Art - Unallocated	£ 1,305		Recordings	£ 70,080	
Live Art Development	£ 32,624		Strategic Initiatives	£ 10,714	
New Collaborations	£ 385,092		Training	£ 15,000	
Notting Hill Carnival Bands	£ 106,365		Touring: General	£ 64,000	
Unallocated	£ 48,500		Early Music Network (Touring)	£ 26,715	
Youth Arts	£ 180,000		Folk/Roots Tours	£ 20,000	
			Jazz Touring	£ 53,000	
Cross-disciplinary Initiatives		£ 456,884	Small Scale Opera Touring	£ 29,869	
Arts and Disability	£ 125,195				
Business Assessment and Planning	£ 2,000		Policy, Research and Planning		£ 39,900
Cultural Diversity	£ 216,060		<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 39,900	
Information Department	£ 9,200				
Participation Fund	£ 80,000		Touring		£ 10,235,928
Women in the Arts	£ 24,429		Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 4,979,800	
			Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 1,872,600	
Dance		£ 21,623,656	Contemporary Music Network	£ 40,895	
National Organisations	£ 10,890,000		Dance Projects	£ 436,852	
Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 6,338,516		Drama Projects	£ 1,281,887	
Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 3,020,900		International Projects	£ 147,800	
National Dance Agencies - Development and Expansion of the Network	£ 61,900		Marketing	£ 70,606	
Black Dance Development	£ 40,050		Opera/Music Theatre Projects	£ 511,000	
Education and Outreach	£ 14,318		Venue Development	£ 340,888	
Independent Projects	£ 757,272		Touring Fund	£ 553,600	
Management Scheme	£ 38,500				
Policy Research	£ 16,000		Visual Arts		£ 4,239,539
Training	£ 101,200		Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 2,372,400	
Touring Fund	£ 345,000		Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 238,000	
			Art Development Funds	£ 40,000	
Drama		£ 2,676,537	Arts Council Collection	£ 23,800	
National Organisations	£ 19,637,000		Artists Resource Centre	£ 14,140	
Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 861,000		Black Exhibition Franchise	£ 27,000	
Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 4,592,400		International Development	£ 39,795	
Middle Scale Touring	£ 110,500		Disability	£ 4,000	
<i>National Touring Projects</i>	£ 959,582		Exhibitions and Events	£ 234,000	
Small Scale Touring	£ 184,230		Interactive Multi-Media	£ 25,000	
Regional Black Theatre Initiative	£ 101,800		International Travel and Research	£ 65,089	
<i>Theatre Writing</i>	£ 222,858		Magazines	£ 141,000	
Drama Training Projects	£ 15,300		National Collection Touring	£ 51,000	
Special Initiatives	£ 80,867		Photography Education	£ 92,790	
			Photography Publishing	£ 130,169	
Education and Training		£ 802,938	Photography Touring	£ 87,351	
Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 21,000		Photography Training and Development	£ 40,000	
Regional Arts Board Development	£ 14,100		Pioneer Fund	£ 30,000	
Research Projects	£ 5,000		Public Art Initiatives	£ 14,370	
Regional Training Centre Development	£ 48,000		Public Art Posts	£ 5,000	
Traineeships	£ 178,212		Strategic Initiatives	£ 217,500	
One-Year Training Projects	£ 123,270		Symposia Fund	£ 20,000	
Two-Year Training Projects	£ 18,896		Touring Exhibition Development	£ 117,013	
Three-Year Training Projects	£ 51,500		Venue Development	£ 90,000	
New Education Fund	£ 230,210		Visual Arts Development	£ 12,765	
Education Projects	£ 112,750		Visual Arts Education	£ 75,000	
			Visual Arts Publications	£ 32,357	
Film Video and Broadcasting		£ 334,468			
Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 13,000		Schedule 1 total		£ 43,670,411
Artist's Film and Video Initiatives	£ 65,931				
Production Awards	£ 74,212				
Unallocated fund	£ 74,712				
Touring Fund	£ 109,600				
Artist's Film and Video Touring Fund	£ 66,225				
International Initiatives		£ 517,220			
<i>List of funded organisations</i>	£ 517,220				
Literature		£ 1,465,651			
Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 729,000				
Writers' Awards	£ 112,000				
Raymond Williams Community Publishing Prizes	£ 5,000				
Cultural Diversity	£ 39,975				
Disability Projects	£ 21,159				
Education	£ 50,605				
Libraries Fund	£ 65,000				
Libretti	£ 9,500				
Literature Development Workers	£ 92,000				
Magazine Development	£ 41,039				
Small Presses	£ 4,284				
Translations	£ 113,553				
Writers and Prisons	£ 37,500				
General Project Fund	£ 91,083				
Literature Touring	£ 53,953				

1995-96					
Schedule 1					
Combined Arts		£ 16,575,651	Literature		£ 1,554,559
National Organisations	£ 13,330,400		Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 733,400	
Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 960,500		Broadcasting	£ 38,158	
Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 491,100		Cultural Diversity	£ 39,125	
Arts 2000	£ 300,000		Disability Projects	£ 16,085	
Black Arts Network	£ 35,446		Education	£ 60,308	
Development Projects	£ 46,560		General Projects	£ 68,010	
International Initiatives	£ 558,365		Independent Tours	£ 15,250	
Live Art Commissions	£ 115,924		Libraries	£ 42,600	
Live Art in Higher Education	£ 9,800		Libretti	£ 5,000	
Live Art Publications	£ 33,400		Literature Development Workers	£ 105,000	
Live Art Travel and Research	£ 9,231		Magazine Development Fund	£ 31,339	
Live Art Development	£ 81,890		Regional Touring Network	£ 10,300	
New Collaborations	£ 410,025		Small Presses	£ 77,129	
Notting Hill Carnival Bands	£ 95,750		Translations	£ 106,561	
Strategic Reserve	£ 67,240		Writers and Prisons	£ 36,254	
Youth Arts	£ 30,000		Writers' Awards	£ 105,000	
			Writers on Radio	£ 32,200	
Cross-disciplinary Initiatives		£ 1,241,932	Writers on Tour	£ 1,240	
Business Assessment and Planning	£ 6,000		Residencies	£ 31,600	
Contingency Fund	£ 1,203,011				
Information	£ 10,310		Music		£ 43,765,380
Policy, Research and Planning	£ 22,611		National Organisations	£ 20,761,000	
			Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 21,059,800	
Dance		£ 22,410,165	Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 118,000	
National Companies	£ 11,215,000		Regional Orchestra's Challenge Funding	£ 450,000	
Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 6,971,016		African, Caribbean and Asian Music	£ 142,575	
Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 2,949,900		Artists' Research and Development Fund	£ 97,930	
National Dance Agency Co-ordination/Expansion	£ 68,500		Bedford Residency	£ 20,000	
Black Dance Development	£ 56,390		Early Music	£ 121,477	
Dance Management Partnerships	£ 62,000		Improvised Music Touring	£ 90,500	
Education	£ 15,550		London-based Chamber Orchestras	£ 100,000	
Independent Dance Projects	£ 828,002		Music and Disability	£ 35,500	
Policy Research	£ 26,750		Music Commissions	£ 137,999	
Training	£ 175,250		Opera / Music Theatre Development	£ 197,250	
Youth Arts	£ 41,707		Period Instrument Ensembles	£ 109,000	
			Recordings	£ 92,096	
Drama		£ 27,340,528	Purcell Tercentary	£ 46,263	
National Organisations	£ 19,637,000		Strategic Initiatives	£ 61,490	
Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 911,000		Education and Training	£ 40,000	
Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 4,855,400		Youth Arts	£ 84,500	
Traineeships	£ 116,500				
Training	£ 2,000		Touring		£ 4,292,568
Middle Scale Touring	£ 150,000		Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 915,000	
National Touring	£ 576,529		Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 250,000	
Regional Black Theatre Initiative	£ 62,130		Audience Development	£ 126,430	
Small Scale Touring	£ 143,954		Contemporary Music Network	£ 28,795	
Small Scale Venue	£ 200,000		Ballet Projects	£ 319,850	
Theatre Writing	£ 233,903		Dance Projects	£ 409,919	
Unallocated	£ 34,500		Drama Projects	£ 1,118,725	
Youth Arts	£ 56,000		International Projects	£ 143,706	
			Large and Middle-scale Opera Touring	£ 312,500	
Education and Training		£ 875,687	Opera/Music Theatre Development	£ 187,759	
Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 136,000		Education	£ 170	
Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 11,000		Venue and Promoter Development	£ 479,714	
Disability and Education	£ 6,310				
Disability Employment Initiative	£ 30,000		Visual Arts		£ 4,707,682
Education Projects	£ 44,976		Regularly Funded Organisations	£ 2,339,000	
Education: Network	£ 52,500		Fixed-term Funded Organisations	£ 373,000	
Research and Development	£ 215,840		Regional Gallery Scheme	£ 105,000	
Further / Higher Education	£ 21,650		Architecture Development	£ 256,564	
International Work	£ 20,000		Artists' Liaison Scheme	£ 15,000	
Joint Initiatives	£ 19,640		Artists' Support Initiatives	£ 3,050	
Partnerships	£ 47,200		Arts Council Collection	£ 20,900	
One Year Projects	£ 69,539		East Midlands African-Caribbean Art	£ 35,000	
Three Year Projects	£ 51,417		Education	£ 167,360	
Regional Training Centre Development	£ 38,000		First Time Publications	£ 83,224	
Traineeships	£ 105,000		Interactive Multi-Media Access	£ 30,000	
Windsor Fellowship	£ 6,615		International Travel and Research	£ 46,053	
			Magazines	£ 128,000	
Film, Video and Broadcasting		£ 379,509	National Artists Association	£ 20,000	
Fixed-term Funded	£ 85,000		National Collections Touring	£ 70,688	
National Distribution Funds:	£ 294,509		Photography Touring	£ 128,600	
			Public Art Forum	£ 15,000	
			Public Art Initiatives	£ 21,300	
			Publications	£ 152,809	
			Site Specific Works	£ 25,000	
			Strategic Initiatives	£ 186,080	
			Touring Exhibition Development	£ 111,783	
			Touring Exhibitions	£ 190,911	
			Training	£ 62,000	
			Venue Development	£ 78,360	
			Schedule 1 total		£ 68,823,472

1996-97					
Schedule 1					
Combined Arts		£ 16,667,761	Literature		£ 1,565,105
National companies	£ 13,330,400		Regularly funded organisations	£ 756,600	
Regularly funded organisations	£ 1,097,100		Broadcasting	£ 15,500	
Fixed-term funded organisations	£ 317,000		Community publishing prizes	£ 5,000	
Arts 2000	£ 500,000		Cultural diversity	£ 31,900	
Black Arts Network	£ 37,500		Disability projects	£ 20,750	
Cultural Diversity	£ 32,500		Education	£ 44,060	
Digital artists and digital technology	£ 7,000		Independent initiatives	£ 44,255	
International initiatives fund	£ 518,880		Independent tours	£ 19,670	
Live art development	£ 661,681		Libraries	£ 41,390	
Notting Hill Carnival bands	£ 97,400		Libretti	£ 8,000	
Strategic initiatives	£ 39,300		Literature developemtn workers	£ 96,000	
Women in the arts	£ 11,000		Magazine development	£ 33,250	
Youth Arts	£ 18,000		Regional Touring Network	£ 20,000	
			Small presses	£ 63,364	
Cross-disciplinary initiatives		£ 1,151,742	Translations	£ 119,795	
Business Assessment and Planning	£ 16,250		Writers' awards	£ 112,000	
Contingency fund	£ 482,000		Writers and Prisons	£ 41,500	
Information	£ 3,671		Writers on Radio	£ 65,779	
Policy, Research and Planning	£ 19,821		Writers' residencies	£ 21,912	
Reserves fund	£ 630,000		Writers on Tour	£ 4,380	
Dance		£ 23,285,984	Music		£ 43,032,791
National organisations	£ 12,027,000		National organisations	£ 19,949,000	
Regularly funded organisations	£ 7,008,016		Regularly funded organisations	£ 21,346,800	
Fixed-term funded organisations	£ 3,084,000		Regional Orchestras Challenge funding	£ 80,000	
National Dance Agencies: development and expansion of the network	£ 72,000		Fixed-term funded organisations	£ 245,000	
Black dance development	£ 35,000		Other funded organisations	£ 40,000	
Dance management partnerships	£ 45,500		African, Caribbean and Asian music	£ 176,772	
Education	£ 21,000		Artists' research and development fund	£ 106,675	
Independent projects	£ 726,000		Bedford residency	£ 20,000	
Policy research	£ 8,550		Early music	£ 109,200	
Strategic projects	£ 91,569		Education and training	£ 18,000	
Training	£ 113,850		Folk music	£ 20,000	
Youth arts	£ 53,500		Improvised music touring	£ 68,990	
			London-based chamber orchestras	£ 30,000	
Drama		£ 27,356,966	Music and disability	£ 33,695	
National companies	£ 19,637,000		Music commissions	£ 168,126	
Regularly funded organisation	£ 911,000		Opera music theatre development	£ 236,182	
Fixed-term funded organisations	£ 4,925,400		Orchestral strategy	£ 45,000	
<i>National touring</i>	£ 573,931		Period instrument ensembles	£ 129,793	
New national touring	£ 224,189		Recordings	£ 77,958	
Middle-scale touring	£ 150,000		Strategic research	£ 47,100	
Regional Black Theatre development	£ 139,424		Youth arts	£ 84,500	
Small-scale touring	£ 145,988				
Small venue development	£ 200,000		Touring		£ 4,455,318
Strategic reserve	£ 13,050		Regularly funded organisations	£ 780,000	
<i>Theatre writing</i>	£ 216,075		Audience development	£ 75,647	
Training	£ 164,909		Contemporary Music Netowrk	£ 393,985	
Youth arts	£ 56,000		Ballet projects	£ 529,639	
			Dance projects	£ 394,350	
Education and Training		£ 852,829	Drama projects	£ 1,163,341	
Regularly funded organisations	£ 109,000		Disability projects	£ 13,900	
Fixed-term funded organisations	£ 45,000		Education projects	£ 7,160	
Other funded organisations	£ 30,000		International projects	£ 136,328	
Three-year projects	£ 19,100		Large and middle-scale opera touring	£ 2,507,000	
Creativity and new technologies	£ 93,695		Opera/music theatre development	£ 239,530	
Disability and education	£ 39,000		Venue and promoter development	£ 470,738	
Disability employment initiative	£ 50,200				
Education mix	£ 62,215		Visual Arts		£ 4,660,553
Education projects	£ 112,880		Regularly funded organisations	£ 2,403,000	
Further/higher education	£ 14,717		Fixed-term funded organisations	£ 543,000	
International projects	£ 20,000		Architecture initiatives	£ 102,495	
Research and development	£ 2,020,572		Artists' liasion scheme	£ 15,250	
Traineeships	£ 54,450		Artists' Resources Centre	£ 22,450	
			Disability initiatives	£ 16,558	
Film, Video and Broadcasting		£ 395,133	Education initiatives	£ 164,294	
Fixed-term funded organisations	£ 85,000		Exhibition research	£ 100,190	
<i>National distribution fund</i>	£ 310,133		First-time publications	£ 80,734	
			Magazines	£ 129,000	
			Marketing	£ 24,750	
			Photography touring	£ 158,100	
			Photography training	£ 52,650	
			Public art initiatives	£ 21,500	
			Regional gallery scheme	£ 124,000	
			Regional venue partnerships	£ 63,000	
			Special projects (site-specific works)	£ 35,000	
			Strategic initiatives	£ 155,195	
			Symposia	£ 23,991	
			Touring exhibitions	£ 191,119	
			Travel grants	£ 35,688	
			Visual arts and photography publications	£ 196,589	
			Schedule 1 total		£ 69,710,415

Departments

1964-65 (Directors)	1965-66 (Directors)	1966-67 (Directors)	1967-68 (Directors)	1969-70 (Directors)
Art	Art	Art	Art	Art
Drama	Drama	Drama	Drama	Drama
Music	Music	Music	Music	Music
	Literature	Literature	Literature	Literature
1970-71 (Directors)	1971-72 (Directors)	1972-73 (Directors)	1973-74 (Directors)	1974-75 (Directors)
Finance	Finance	Finance	Finance	Finance
Art	Art	Art	Art	Art
Exhibitions	Exhibitions	Exhibitions	Exhibitions	Exhibitions
Drama	Drama	Drama	Drama	Drama
Music	Music	Music	Music	Music
Literature	Literature	Literature	Literature	Literature
			Regional Development	Regional Development
1975-76 (Directors)	1976-77 (Directors)	1977-78 (Directors)	1978-79 (Directors)	1979-80 (Directors)
Finance	Finance	Finance	Finance	Finance
Art	Art	Art	Art	Art
Exhibitions	Exhibitions	Drama	Drama	Drama
Drama	Drama	Music	Music	Music
Music	Music	Literature	Dance	Dance
Literature	Literature	Touring	Literature	Literature
Touring	Touring		Touring	Regional
				Personnel and Administration
1980-81 (Directors)	1981-82 (Directors)	1982-83 (Directors)	1983-84 (Directors)	1984-85 (Directors)
Finance	Finance	Finance	Finance	Finance
Art	Art	Art	Art	Art
Drama	Drama	Drama	Drama	Drama
Music	Music	Music	Music	Music
Dance	Dance	Dance	Dance	Dance
Literature	Literature	Literature	Literature	Literature
Regional	Regional	Regional	Regional	Regional
Personnel and Admin	Personnel and Admin	Personnel and Admin	Personnel and Admin	Personnel and Admin
1985-86 (Directors)	1986-87	1987-88 (Directors)	1988-89 (Directors)	1989-90 (Directors)
		Finance	Finance	Finance
Art		Arts Co-ordination	Arts Co-ordination	Arts Co-ordination
Drama		Visual Arts	Visual Arts	Visual Arts
Music		Dance	Dance	Dance
Dance		Drama	Drama	Drama
Literature (interim)		Film, Video and Broadcasting	Film, Video and Broadcasting	Film, Video and Broadcasting
Controller of Touring		Literature	Incentive Funding	Incentive Funding
Film, Video and Broadcasting		Music	Literature	Literature
Arts Co-ordination			Music	Music
			Marketing and Resources	Marketing and Resources
			Planning	Planning
			Touring	Touring
			Personnel and Training	Personnel and Training
1990-91 (Directors)	1991-92 (Directors)	1992-93 (Directors)	1993-94 (Directors)	1994-95 (Directors)
Finance	Arts Development Division	Arts Development Division	Arts Development Division	Finance and Resources Division
Arts Co-ordination	Dance	Drama	Dance	Personnel
Dance	Drama	Film Video and Broadcasting	Drama	Combined Arts
Drama	Film, Video and Broadcasting	Literature	Film Video and Broadcasting	Dance
Film, Video and Broadcasting	Literature	Music	Literature	Drama
Incentive Funding	Music	Touring	Music	Film, Video and Broadcasting
Literature	Touring	Visual Arts	Touring	Literature
Marketing and Resources	Visual Arts	External Relations	Visual Arts	Music
Music	Policy and Planning	Finance and Resources Division	Policy and Planning	Touring
Personnel and Training	External Relations	Personnel	External Relations	Visual Arts
Planning	Finance and Resources Divisions		Personnel	Education and Training
Touring	Personnel			Policy, Research and Planning
Visual Arts				National Lottery
1995-96 (Directors)	1996-97 (Directors)			
Policy, Research and Planning	Finance and Resources Division			
Finance and Resources Division	Personnel			
Personnel	Combined Arts			
Combined Arts	Dance			
Dance	Drama			
Drama	Film, Video and Broadcasting			
Education and Training	Literature			
Film, Video and Broadcasting	Music			
Literature	Touring			
Music	Visual Arts			
Touring	Education and Training			
Visual Arts	Policy, Research and Planning			
National Lottery	National Lottery			
	Lottery Operations			
	Lottery Communications			
	Lottery Film Unit			
	Lottery Projects			

Appendix Five: Extract from The Glory of the Garden

Client Assessment Criteria

- a. Quality of artistic product, including, as appropriate, standards of presentation, performance, design and direction, and their relationship to the company's overall programme;
- b. Actual and potential creative strength in relation to both new and established work;
- c. The extent to which stated aims and objectives are realised;
- d. The fullest practicable use of facilities and the widest provision of the arts to the community;
- e. Education policy in relation to the artistic programme;
- f. The employment and other opportunities extended to members of ethnic minority groups;
- g. Overall value for money, including any success in extending audiences through other media;
- h. Box office and attendance returns;
- i. The company's success in raising local authority support and other income;
- j. The efficiency shown in using available resources and the accuracy and control of budgeting;

- k. The urgency and nature of any fundamental financial problems;
- l. The adequacy and security of tenure of premises;
- m. The balance of provision between London and other regions;
- n. The Council's existing declared policies, particularly the emphasis which it places on full-time professional work.

Appendix Six: Extract from Comprehensive Spending Review 1998

DEPARTMENT FOR CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT

Aim

To improve the quality of life for all through cultural and sporting activities, and to strengthen the creative industries.

The Department will:

work to bring quality and excellence in the fields of culture, media and sport; make these available to the many, not just the few; raise standards of cultural education and training; and help to develop the jobs of the future in the creative industries.

Objectives

The Department, in partnership with others, works to:

- Create an efficient and competitive market by removing obstacles to growth and unnecessary regulation so as to promote Britain's success in the fields of culture, media, sport and tourism at home and abroad.
- Broaden access to a rich and varied cultural and sporting life. Raise standards of cultural education and training.
- Ensure that everyone has the opportunity to achieve excellence in the areas of culture, media and sport and to develop talent, innovation and good design.
- Maintain public support for the National Lottery and ensure that the objective of the Lottery Fund supports DCMS and other national priorities.
- Promote the role of the Department's sectors in urban and rural

regeneration and in combatting social exclusion.

In carrying out these objectives the Department will seek maximum value for money in using its human and financial resources, through applying the principles of efficiency and effectiveness in its sectors and encouraging partnerships with others.

Extract taken from “Comprehensive Spending Review Aims and Objectives”
published by HM Treasury 14 July 1998

Appendix Seven: The Omnibus Survey Question Sets

This appendix sets out the question sets from the four iterations of the Omnibus Arts Survey, from 1991, the 2000 Pilot, the 2001 Main survey, and the 2003-4 survey

1. Extracts from:

**RSGB OMNIBUS ARTS SURVEY: REPORT ON A SURVEY ON
ARTS AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES IN G.B.**

RESEARCH SURVEYS OF GREAT BRITAIN LIMITED, 1991

“Objectives

- “Assist in the preparation of a National Arts and Media Strategy for Great Britain
- To establish baseline information on attendance, participation and other forms of interest in arts and cultural activities together with attitudes to funding, provision, access, education and the influence of broadcasting. These figures will provide a basis for comparison through similar surveys to be conducted 3 years after the implementation of the National Arts and Media Strategy
- To obtain information which will help organisations receiving Arts Council funding to further develop their audiences.

Throughout the project RSGB have worked closely with Peter Verwey, Senior

Marketing Officer of the Arts Council” (p.1).

Method

Questions were included in RSGB’s General Omnibus Survey in June/July 1991. Appendix B contains a copy of the questionnaire. An omnibus survey enables a number of clients to ask questions within the same interview, thus sharing costs of locating respondents and collecting demographic information. It is a widely accepted cost-effective form of market research among national samples of the population” (p.1). There was a sample size of 7919

The main findings are presented in a series of tables, with data disaggregated by age, by socio-economic status, and by region, but not the same time.

The questionnaire was as follows (Appendix B of the report)

“Now I would like to ask you about arts and cultural activities.

SHOW CARDS 1, 2 and 3

ROTATE ORDER OF SHOWING

Card 1

- Plays
- Opera
- Musicals
- Variety/pantomime
- Cinema/Films
- Ballet
- Contemporary dance

- Folk dancing
- Ballroom dancing
- Mime
- Scottish dance
- Welsh dance
- English dance
- Irish dance
- African dance
- Caribbean dance
- South Asian dance
- Dance of other country or culture

Card 2

- Orchestral music
- Choral music
- Jazz
- Rock music
- Pop music
- Gospel music
- Reggae
- Bhangra
- Folk music
- Country and Western Music

- Scottish music
- Welsh music
- English music
- Irish music
- African music
- Caribbean music
- South Asian music
- Oriental music

Card 3

- Museums
- Painting/sculpture exhibitions or galleries
- Photography exhibitions or galleries
- Craft exhibitions or galleries
- Stately homes
- Poetry or literature readings

Q1 which, if any, of these do you ever attend nowadays as a visitor or member of the audience? PROBE Which others? Any others?

If none coded at Q1 skip to Q3

Q2 About how often do you go to (Answer at Q1) Please take your answer from this card (options: at least 4 times a year, two or three times a year, once a year or less, don't know)

Show card 5 for Q3-6

Card 5

- Plays
- Opera
- Musicals
- Variety/Pantomime
- Poetry or literature readings
- Orchestral music
- Choral music
- Jazz
- Rock music
- Pop music
- Gospel music
- Reggae
- Bhangra
- Folk music
- Country and Western Music
- Scottish music
- Welsh music
- English music
- Irish music
- African music

- Caribbean music
- South Asian music
- Oriental music
- Music of other country or culture
- None of these/DK

Q3 which of these, if any, do you make a point of watching on television at all nowadays? PROBE - Which others?

Q4. And which, if any, do you watch on pre-recorded video nowadays?
PROBE Which others?

Q5. And which of these, if any, do you make a point of listening to on the radio?
PROBE - which others?

Q6. And which, if any, do you listen to on record, tapes, or C.D.s? PROBE,
which others?

Show Card 6 for Q7-Q8

Card 6

- Films
- Ballet
- Contemporary dance
- Folk dancing
- Ballroom dancing
- Mime
- Scottish dance

- Welsh dance
- English dance
- Irish dance
- African dance
- Caribbean dance
- South Asian dance
- None of these/DK

Q.7. And which of these, if any, do you make a point of watching on television at all nowadays? PROBE Which others?

Q8 And which, if any, do you watch on pre-recorded video nowadays? PROBE Which others?

Q9 (Show card 7) In which of these activities, if any, do you take an active part at all nowadays, but not as a full-time professional? PROBE - Any others

Card 7

- Drama
- Scottish dancing
- Welsh dancing
- English dancing
- Irish dancing
- African dancing
- Caribbean dancing

- South Asian dancing
- Dancing of other country or culture (Code and write in)
- Folk dancing
- Ballroom dancing
- Disco dancing
- Other dancing/ballet
- Writing poetry
- Writing stories/articles
- Painting/drawing
- Sculpture
- Photography
- Making films
- Making Videos
- None of these.

Q10 (show card 8) and which of these, if any, do you do at all nowadays but not as a full-time professional?

Card 8

- Pottery
- Metalwork
- Woodwork
- Glass making
- Jewellery making

- Working with textiles
- None of these

Q.11 AN how would you describe the extent of your participation in(ANSWER at Q9/Q10) Is it regular, occasional, very infrequent?

Show Card 9

Q 12 And in which of these, if any, do you take an active part at all nowadays, but not as a full-time professional

Card 9

- Opera/light opera
- Gospel
- Choir
- Other singing (to an audience)
- Orchestral music
- Chamber music
- Folk music
- Jazz
- "Country & Western" music
- Electro-acoustic music
- Rock music
- Pop music
- Bhangra
- Reggae

- Scottish music
- Welsh music
- English music
- Irish music
- African music
- Caribbean music
- South Asian music
- Oriental music
- Indonesian music
- Music of other country or culture (code and write in)
- Playing a musical instrument solo
- None of these/don't know

Q13: An how would you describe the extent of your participation in(answer at Q.12) Is it regular, occasional or very infrequent?

REPEAT Q13 FOR EACH ACTIVITY CODED AT Q.12

Q14 (show card 10) I'm now going to read out a number of things people have said about arts and cultural activities, that is, the sorts of things we have mentioned today. Please could you tell me, taking your answer from this card, how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

Card 10

- Arts and cultural activities help to enrich the quality of our lives
- Arts and cultural activities help to bring people together in local

communities

- If my home area lost its arts and cultural activities, people living here would lose something of value
- Arts and cultural activities give me a lot of pleasure and entertainment
- People who are not interested in arts and cultural activities should not be expected to pay towards them
- I have sometimes decided not to attend particular kinds of arts or cultural events largely because I was worried about what my family or friends would say
- If you are brought up with the arts and culture you appreciate them more
- I mainly like to see events that relate to my cultural background
- People cannot appreciate arts and cultural activities unless they have had their interest developed at school or in later education
- Arts and cultural activities help to bring visitors into my area
- Arts and cultural activities are, for me, something to share with my friends
- Arts and cultural activities are boring

(Options: Agree strongly, tend to agree, neither agree nor disagree, tend to disagree, disagree strongly, don't know)

Q.15 (show card 11) How interested, if at all, would you say you are in arts and cultural events and activities generally?

Card 11

- Very interested

- Quite interested
- Not very interested
- Not at all interested
- DK

Q.16 Do you have any personal or travel difficulties in going out to arts and cultural events which interest you in you area?

IF YES ASK - what sort of difficulties

(List provided)

- Age
- Ill health
- Disability
- Concern about appropriate facilities/access
- Can't afford it/cost
- Family commitments
- Lack of own transport
- Poor public transport
- Fear of going out in the evening
- Can't get out when they're on
- Other (code and write in)

NO

- No difficulties

- Don't know

Q.17 Have you, in the last 12 months, been put off going to any arts or cultural event because you thought that the ticket or admission prices were too high, or not?

Answer: YES/NO/DK

IF YES

Q.18 what sort of events were you put off going to because of price? PROBE FULLY

List for coding:

- Plays
- Opera
- Musicals
- Variety/Pantomime
- Cinema/films
- Ballet
- Contemporary dance
- Folk dancing
- Ballroom dancing
- Mime
- Scottish dance
- Welsh dance
- English dance

- Irish dance
- African dance
- Caribbean dance
- South Asian dance
- Dance of other country or culture (code and write in)
- Orchestral music
- Choral music
- Jazz
- Rock music
- Pop music
- Gospel music
- Reggae
- Bhangra
- Folk music
- Country and Western Music
- Scottish music
- Welsh music
- English music
- Irish music
- African music
- Caribbean music
- South Asian music

- Oriental music
- Music of another country or culture (code and write in)
- Museums
- Painting/sculpture exhibitions or galleries
- Photography exhibitions or galleries
- Craft exhibitions or galleries
- Stately homes
- Poetry or literature readings

Q.19 (show card 12) How, if at all, does watch arts performances on television affect your decision to attend live arts performances, or films in the cinema or elsewhere

Card 12

- Makes me more likely to attend live arts events/films of the same kind
- Makes me less likely to attend live arts events/films of the same kind
- Makes me less likely to attend other types of live arts events/films
- Makes no difference to whether I attend live arts events/films
- (Don't watch arts events/Films on TV)
- DK

Q.20 Do you think there are enough arts or cultural events of interest which are accessible to you in your area, or not? YES - ENOUGH, NO - NOT ENOUGH
DK

Q.21 What would you like more of?

PROBE FULLY, CHECK LIST CAREFULLY BEFORE CODING OTHER

- Plays
- Opera
- Musicals
- Variety/Pantomime
- Cinema/films
- Ballet
- Contemporary dance
- Folk dancing
- Ballroom dancing
- Mime
- Scottish dance
- Welsh dance
- English dance
- Irish dance
- African dance
- Caribbean dance
- South Asian dance
- Dance of other country or culture (code and write in)
- Orchestral music
- Choral music
- Jazz

- Rock music
- Pop music
- Gospel music
- Reggae
- Bhangra
- Folk music
- Country and Western Music
- Scottish music
- Welsh music
- English music
- Irish music
- African music
- Caribbean music
- South Asian music
- Oriental music
- Music of another country or culture (code and write in)
- Museums
- Painting/sculpture exhibitions or galleries
- Photography exhibitions or galleries
- Craft exhibitions or galleries
- Stately homes
- Poetry or literature readings

Q22 DO you make a point of watch on television or listening on the radio to programmes which review or discuss arts and cultural activities and events, or not? YES/NO/DK

Q.23. Do you make a point of reading, in newspapers or magazines, reviews, write-ups or articles about arts and cultural activities and events - or not? YES/NO/DK

Q.24a How often, if at all, do you read poetry nowadays? Is it regularly, occasionally, infrequently or never?

Q24b. How often, if at all, do you read books, either fiction or non-fiction, nowadays? Is it regularly, occasionally, infrequently, or never?

Q. 25 have you in the last 12 months bought either of the following?

- An original work of art such as a painting, drawing, sculpture or limited edition print?
- A craft work such as pottery, woodcarving or handmade jewellery?

Q.26 Do you think that public money should be used to support arts and cultural activities or not? YES/NO/DK

Q.27 DO you think that some of this public money should be used to encourage new and experimental work or not? YES/NO/DK

Q.28 Do you have any long term illness, health problem, or disability which limits or which other people might consider limits your daily activities or the work you can do?

IF YES, ASK Could you tell me what it is?

- Age

- Ill health
- Mobility
- Sight
- Hearing
- Other (code and write in)

NO - none, DK

Q.29 What is your ethnic origin? Please take your answer from this card:

- European
- African
- Caribbean
- Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi
- Chinese
- Other Asian
- Other ethnic origin (code and write in)
- Refused

Q.30 In which country did you mainly spend the first ten years of your life?

- England
- Scotland
- Wales
- N. Ireland
- Eire/S.Ireland
- Other Europe

- The Caribbean (Jamaica etc)
- Africa
- India/Pakistan/Bangladesh
- Middle East (Egypt, Israel etc)
- Far East (China, Hong Kong, Japan etc)
- USA/Canada
- South/Central America
- Australia/New Zealand
- Other (code and write in)

Q.31 Do you have use of a car?

Q.32 At what age did you finish your full time education

IF STILL STUDYING ASK: at what age do you expect to finish your full time education?

15 or under, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 or over.

Appendix C - RSGB Random Location sampling method

“Within the block of addresses, interviewers are set a number of interviews to be achieved against a quota of men, housewives and other women. Further quota controls are placed on working status (men and housewives) and presence of children (housewives only). This method has been found to produce samples of men, housewives and other women which are representative of the population to a satisfactory degree.”

The 2000 pilot Omnibus Survey Question Set

Taken from The Arts in England: Attendance, Participation and Attitudes
(Jermyn, H., Skelton, A., Bridgwood, A., & Arts Council of England. (2001)

Ask all respondents

Q1

I am now going to ask you some questions about what you do in your spare time.

I would like you to look at this card and tell me which, if any, of these things you have been to in the last 12 months.

Please exclude any events that you have attended at a school or 6th form college.

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. A film at a cinema, arts centre, a film club or society
2. A musical
3. A pantomime
4. A play or drama
5. An exhibition of photography, drawing, painting, printing, sculpture or installation art
6. Live/performance art or video/multimedia event or exhibition
7. A Craft exhibition (but not crafts markets)

8. Cultural festival (such as Mela, Chinese New Year Festival or Diwali)
9. Carnival, street arts and circus (not animals)
10. An arts festival
11. A poetry/book reading, mushairas, performance poetry or other literary event
12. None of these

Q2 And from this card, (which if any of these things have you been to in the last 12 months?)

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. A pop music/rock concert
2. A performance of opera/operetta
3. A classical music concert
4. A jazz concert
5. A folk concert (including British, Asian, American etc) or country and western music concert
6. A gospel music concert
7. Some other live music event
8. A live dance performance
9. None of these

Ask people who have attended a live dance performance

Q3 What sort of dance was it

1. African people's dance

2. Ballet
3. Contemporary dance
4. South Asian Dance
5. Some other dance event

Ask about all the events listed in Qus 1-3

Q4 Thinking about the last 12 months, approximately how many times have you attended this event?

1. Once
2. Twice
3. 3-5 times
4. 6-10 times
5. 11-20 times
6. More than 20 times

Q5 And thinking about the last 4 weeks, how many times have you attended this event?

Ask all those who attended at least one event in the last 12 months excluding film, rock/pop event, and Country & Western event

Q6 May I just check what was the last event that you went to?

1. A musical
2. A play/drama
3. A pantomime
4. An exhibition of photography, drawing, painting, printing, sculpture or

installation art?

5. Live/performance art or video/multimedia event or exhibition?
6. A craft exhibition (but not crafts markets)?
7. Cultural festival (such as Mela, Chinese New Year Festival or Diwali)
8. Carnival, street arts and circus (not animals)
9. An arts festival
10. A poetry/book reading, mushairas, performance poetry or other literary

event

11. A performance of opera/operetta
12. A classical music concert
13. A jazz concert?
14. A gospel music concert?
15. Some other live music event
16. A live dance performance

What were your reasons for going to the event at Q6

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Wanted to see a specific performer or event
2. Went as I like going to that type of event
3. Something to do on a special occasion
4. Went along as a social event
5. Was invited along, so I just went
6. Had a friend or relative involved in event/activity

7. It was recommended by a friend or relative
8. It was a religious festival/event
9. Related to studies
10. Other

Ask all those who gave more than one reason at Q7

May I just check, what was your main reason for going

CODE ONE ONLY

1. Wanted to see a specific performer or event
2. Went as I like going to that type of event
3. Something to do on a special occasion
4. Went along as a social event
5. Was invited along, so I just went
6. Had a friend or relative involved in event/activity
7. It was recommended by a friend or relative
8. It was a religious festival/event
9. Related to studies
10. Other

Ask all respondents

Q9 I would like you to look at this card and tell me which, if any, of these things you have done in the last 12 months.

Please include things like community events and festivals but exclude anything you have done as part of your job, at school or 6th form college

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Buy a novel, other work of fiction, play or book of poetry for yourself
2. Read a novel, other work of fiction, play or book of poetry
3. Write any stories or plays
4. Write any poetry
5. None of these

Q10 And from this card, which, if any, of these things you have done in the last 12 months

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Go clubbing
2. Do any ballet
3. Do any other dance (exclude fitness classes/aerobics)
4. Sing to an audience or rehearse for a performance (exclude karaoke)
5. Play a musical instrument to an audience or rehearse for a performance or event
6. Play a musical instrument for your own pleasure (either alone or with others)
7. Write or compose a piece of music
8. Perform in a play/drama or rehearse for a performance
9. Perform in an opera/operetta or rehearse for a performance
10. Help with the organisation or running of an arts or cultural event including box office, costume making, publicity, make-up, lighting, stage management etc

11. None of these

Q11 And from this card, which, if any, of these things you have done in the last 12 months

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Do any painting, drawing, printmaking or sculpture
2. Do any photography as an artistic activity (not family or holiday snaps)
3. Make any films or videos as an artistic activity (not family or holidays)
4. Use computers to create any original artworks or animation
5. Do any textile crafts such as embroidery, crocheting, knitting or sewing
6. Do any wood crafts
7. Do any other crafts such as calligraphy, metalwork, pottery, book binding or jewellery making
8. Buy any original works of art
9. Buy any original/handmade crafts (such as pottery, jewellery)
10. None of these

Ask about each activity mentioned at Qs9-11, except clubbing, buying original works of art or buying original/handmade crafts

Q12 how often to you usually do (name of activity)?

1. More than once a week
2. Once a week
3. Once or twice a month
4. Five or six times a year/every two months

5. Three or four times a year

6. Once or twice a year

7. Less than once a year.

Q13 How many times in the last 4 weeks did you (name of activity)?

Q14 Did you (name of activity) as part of a cultural festival such as Mela,
Chinese New Year, Diwali etc

1. Yes

2. No

3. Don't know

Ask all those who sang or played a musical instrument to an audience or
played a musical instrument for pleasure

Q15 What type/s of music do you sing/perform/play?

1. Classical

2. Choral

3. Jazz

4. Pop/rock

5. Other

Ask all respondents

Q16 Now I'm going to ask you a couple of questions about participating in arts
related activities through classes or membership of clubs and groups.

Have you taken any classes or lessons during the last 12 months in any of the
subjects on this card

Please include private tuition but exclude anything you have done as part of your job, at school or 6th Form College or as part of a higher education (degree) course.

1. Music, singing or playing an instrument
2. Drama or dance
3. Creative writing
4. Photography or film making
5. Painting, drawing, printmaking, sculpture or visual art
6. Crafts
7. Other arts activity (specify)
8. None of these

Q17 In the last 12 months have you actively taken part in any of the following?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. A choir or vocal group
2. Some other music-making group such as a band, group, orchestra, or ensemble
3. A drama, theatre or dance group
4. A writers group
5. A photography or film making club or society
6. Painting, drawing, printmaking or other visual arts group (but not arts appreciation)
7. Other arts group (specify)

8. None of these.

Q18 I am now going to ask you a few questions about watching and listening to arts events though television, radio and recordings such as compact disc or video.

Which, if any, of the following have you listened to on compact disc, mini disc, tape or record during the last 4 weeks?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Rock/pop
2. Classical music
3. Opera/operetta
4. Jazz
5. A poetry or book reading
6. A play (exclude films, TV dramas, comedies etc)
7. Dance
8. None of these

Q19 which, if any, of the following have you listened to on the radio during the last 4 weeks?

1. Rock/pop
2. Classical music
3. Opera/operetta
4. Jazz
5. A poetry or book reading

6. A play (exclude films, TV dramas, comedies etc)
7. Dance
8. None of these

Q20. Which, if any, have you watched on television, video or DVD during the last 4 weeks?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Rock/pop
2. Classical music
3. Opera/operetta
4. Jazz
5. A poetry or book reading
6. A play (exclude films, TV dramas, comedies etc)
7. Dance
8. None of these

Q21 In the last 4 weeks, have you watched, listened or read reviews about any of these events or cultural activities on television or radio, or in newspapers or magazines? Please choose your answers from the card

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Film
2. Rock/pop music
3. Classical music
4. Opera/operetta

5. Jazz
6. A poetry or book reading
7. A play (exclude films, TV dramas, comedies etc)
8. Dance
9. None of these

Q22 In the last 4 weeks have you watched or listened to any other arts programme on the television, video or radio? Please choose your answers from this card

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Film
2. Rock/pop music
3. Classical music
4. Opera/operetta
5. Jazz
6. A poetry or book reading
7. A play (exclude films, TV dramas, comedies etc)
8. Dance
9. None of these

Q23 During the last 12 months have you used the internet to look at works of visual arts such as paintings or sculpture, or listen or view any classical music, jazz, opera/operetta or plays or dance?

Please choose your answers from the card.

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Works of visual arts such as paintings or sculpture
2. Rock/pop
3. Classical music
4. Opera/operetta
5. Jazz
6. A poetry or book reading
7. A play (exclude films, TV dramas, comedies etc)
8. Dance
9. None of these

Q24 During the last 12 months have you used the internet to find out about or order tickets for art exhibitions or live performances of music, (not pop/rock) opera/operetta. Book/poetry readings, plays or dance?

1. Yes
2. No

Q25 I would now like to ask you about your opinions about different aspects of the arts and culture

[*] Thinking about all the different types of arts and cultural events that I have asked you about, do you think the amount of arts and cultural events and activities available to people in your area is...

1. Much too high
2. Too high

3. About right
4. Too low
5. Much too low
6. Don't know

Q26 [*] Do you think the amount of public money spend on arts and cultural events and activities in your area is...

1. Much too high
2. Too high
3. About right
4. Too low
5. Much too low
6. Don't know

Q27 [*] Now thinking about the country as a whole, do you think the amount of public money spent on arts and cultural events and activities in this country as a whole is...

1. Much too high
2. Too high
3. About right
4. Too low
5. Much too low
6. Don't know

[*] indicates an opinion question. Interviewers are instructed to read out the

question exactly as worded.

I'm going to read out some things people have said about arts and culture and I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagreed with each statement, choosing your answer from this card.

Q28 People who don't go to arts and cultural activities should not have to pay towards them

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know

Q29 I believe it is right at that there should be public funding of arts and cultural projects

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know

Q30 I would feel out of place in an art gallery, museum or theatre

1. Strongly agree

2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know

Q31 People have plenty of opportunities to go to the arts and cultural events

if they want to

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know

Q32 All school children should have the opportunity to learn to play a musical instrument, learn poetry, take part in plays or participate in other arts activities.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know

Q33 Arts from different cultures contribute a lot to this country

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know

Q34 The arts play a valuable role in my life

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know

Q35 If my area lost its arts and cultural activities, the people living here would lose something of value

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know

Q36 The arts play a valuable role in the life of the country

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know

Q37 People who don't go to arts and cultural events aren't missing out on much

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know

Q38 Do you have any long standing illness, disability or infirmity

By longstanding I mean anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time

1. Yes
2. No

Ask respondents who have a long standing illness or disability

Q39 Does this illness or disability (do any of these illnesses or disabilities limit your activities in any way?

1. Yes

2. No

3. The 2001 Omnibus Survey Question Set

Q1. I am now going to ask you about some things that you may have done in your leisure time or for entertainment.

I would like you to look at this card and tell me which, if any, these things you have visited or attended in the last 12 months.

Please include things like community events but exclude any events that you have attended as part of your jobs, or vents produced by a school or 6th form college

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. A film at a cinema or other venue
2. Public Library
3. Museum/art gallery
4. Stately home/castle/garden
5. Well known park or gardens
6. Exhibition or collection of art, photography or sculpture
7. Craft exhibition (not crafts markets)
8. Event including video or electronic art
9. Event connected with books or writing
10. None of these

Q2 And from this card, (which, if any, of these things have you visited or attended in the last 12 months)?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Carnival, street arts and circus (not animals)
2. Cultural festival
3. Musical
4. Pantomime
5. Play/drama
6. Opera/operetta
7. Classical music concert
8. Jazz concert
9. Other live music event
10. Live dance event
11. None of these

Ask people who have attended a music event

Q3 What sort of music event was it?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Rock/pop
2. Folk or Country & Western
3. Some other music

Ask people who have attended a live dance performance

Q4. What sort of dance event was it?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. African People's Dance
2. Ballet

3. Contemporary dance

4. South Asian dance

5. Some other dance

Ask about all events listed in Qs 1-4

Q5 Thinking about the last 12 months, approximately how many times have you visited or attended this event?

Q6 And thinking about the last four weeks, have you visited or attended this event?

1. Yes

2. No

Ask all those who attended at least one arts events in the last 12 months

Q7 May I just check, what was the last event or place that you went to. Was it...

CODE FIRST THAT APPLIES

1. The exhibition or collection of art, photography or sculpture?

2. The craft exhibition?

3. The event connected with books or writing?

4. The carnival?

5. The cultural festival?

6. The musical or pantomime?

7. The play or drama?

8. The opera or operetta?

9. The classical music concert?

10. The jazz concert?

11. The dance event?

12. The event including video or electronic art?

Q8 What were your reasons for going to the event at Q7

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. See specific performer or event

2. Like going to that type of event

3. Special occasion/celebration

4. Social event

5. Invited to go

6. Recommended by a friend or relative

7. Accompanying children

8. Happened to be passing by

9. Other

Ask all that gave more than one reason at Q8

Q9 May I just check, what was your main reason for going?

CODE ONE ONLY

1. See specific performer or event

2. Like going to that type of event

3. Special occasion/celebration

4. Social event

5. Invited to go
6. Recommended by a friend or relative
7. Accompanying children
8. Happened to be passing by
9. Other

Ask all respondents

Q10 Thinking about the arts and cultural events I've asked you about, if you could attend or visit them as often as you wanted, would you be interested in doing so (more than you do now)?

1. Yes
2. No

Q11 Here is a list of things which people say prevent them from visiting or attending (more) events. Looking at this card, could you tell me know which, if any, apply to you?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Its difficult to find time
2. It costs too much
3. I'm not really interested
4. I don't have anyone to go with
5. I might feel uncomfortable or out of place
6. My health is not good enough
7. Lack of transport

8. Other

9. None of these

Q12 I would like you to look at this card and tell me which, if any, of these things you have done in the last 12 months.

Please include things like community events and festivals but exclude anything that you have done as part of your job, at school or 6th form college

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Read for pleasure (not newspapers, magazines or comics)

2. Buy a novel, or book of stories, poetry or plays for yourself

3. Write any stories or plays

4. Write any poetry

5. None of these

Ask all who read for pleasure

Q13 Can you tell me what sort of things you have read for pleasure over the last 12 months

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Work of fiction, play, novel or story

2. Poetry

3. Biography

4. Non-fiction/factual

5. Other

Q14 and from this card (which, if any, of these things have you done in the

last 12 months)?

Ask all respondents

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1. Clubbing
2. Do ballet
3. Dance for fitness such as aerobics
4. Other dance
5. Sing to an audience or rehearse for a performance (not karaoke)
6. Play musical instrument to an audience or rehearse for a performance
7. Play musical instrument for your own pleasure
8. Write any music
9. Rehearse or perform in play/drama
10. Rehearse or perform in opera/operetta
11. Help with running of an arts/cultural event or arts organisation
12. None of these

Q15 and from this card (which, if any, of these things have you done in the last 12 months)?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Painting, drawing, printmaking or sculpture
- (2) Photography as an artistic activity (not family or holiday 'snaps')
- (3) Make films or videos as an artistic activity (not family or holidays)

- (4) create original artworks or animation using computer
- (5) Textile crafts such as embroidery, crocheting or knitting
- (6) Wood crafts such as wood turning, carving or furniture making
- (7) Other crafts such as calligraphy, pottery or jewellery making
- (8) Buy any original works of art for yourself
- (9) Buy any original/handmade crafts such as pottery or jewellery for yourself
- (10) None of these

Ask about each activity mentioned at Qs 12, 13, 14-15, except buying art or craft, clubbing and dance for fitness

Q16 How often do you usually do [name of activity]?

- (1) At least once a week
- (2) At least once a month
- (3) Every two or three months
- (4) Two or three times a year
- (5) Once a year
- (6) Less than once a year

Ask all those who sang or played a musical instrument to an audience or played a musical instrument for pleasure

Q17 What type(s) of music do you sing/perform/play?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Classical
- (2) Choral

- (3) Jazz
- (4) Rock/pop
- (5) Other

Ask all respondents

Q18 Now I'm going to ask you a couple of questions about participating in arts-related activities through classes or membership of clubs and groups.

Have you taken any classes or lessons during the last 12 months in any of the subjects on this card? Please include private tuition but exclude anything you have done as part of your job, at school or sixth form college, or as part of a higher education (degree) course.

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Music, singing or playing an instrument
- (2) Drama or dance
- (3) Creative writing
- (4) Photography or film making
- (5) Painting, drawing or other visual art (not arts appreciation)
- (6) Craft
- (7) Other art classes or lessons not mentioned above
- (8) None of these

Q19 In the last 12 months have you actively taken part in any of the following?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Choir or vocal group

- (2) Other music-making group
- (3) Drama, theatre or dance group
- (4) Writers' group
- (5) Photography or film making group
- (6) Painting, drawing, printmaking or other visual arts group
(not arts appreciation)
- (7) Other arts group
- (8) None of these

Q20 I'm now going to ask you a few questions about watching and listening to arts events through television, radio and recordings such as CD or video.

Looking at this card, which, if any, have you listened to on CD, mini disc, tape or record during the last four weeks?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Rock/pop
- (2) Classical music
- (3) Opera/opera
- (4) Jazz
- (5) Poetry/book reading or performance
- (6) A play
- (7) Dance
- (8) None of these

Q21 Looking at this card, which, if any, have you listened to on the radio during the last four weeks?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Rock/pop
- (2) Classical music
- (3) Opera/operetta
- (4) Jazz
- (5) Poetry/book reading or performance
- (6) A play
- (7) Dance
- (8) None of these

Q22 Looking at this card, which, if any, have you watched on television, video or DVD during the last four weeks?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Rock/pop
- (2) Classical music
- (3) Opera/operetta
- (4) Jazz
- (5) Poetry/book reading or performance
- (6) A play
- (7) Dance
- (8) None of these

Q23 During the last 12 months have you used the internet to look at, watch, or listen to any of the things on this card?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Works of visual art
- (2) Rock/pop
- (3) Classical music
- (4) Opera/operetta
- (5) Jazz
- (6) Poetry or book reading
- (7) A play
- (8) Dance
- (9) None of these

Q24 During the last 12 months have you used the internet to find out about or order tickets for art exhibitions or live performances of music (not pop/rock), opera/operetta, book/poetry readings, plays or dance?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

Q25 I would now like to ask you about your opinions about different aspects of the arts and culture.

Looking at this card, which of the statements best describes the availability of facilities and activities such as theatres, museums, concerts and exhibitions to people living in your local area?

- (1) Almost all of these activities/facilities are available locally
- (2) Some of these activities/facilities are available locally
- (3) These activities/facilities are not available locally but I can get to them fairly easily

(4) These activities/facilities are not within easy reach

Q26 Do you think the amount of public money spent on arts and cultural events and activities that are within your area is too high, about right or too low?

(1) Much too high

(2) Too high

(3) About right

(4) Too low

(5) Much too low

(6) Don't know

Q27 Now thinking about the country as a whole, do you think the amount of public money spent on arts and cultural events and activities in this country as a whole is too high, about right or too low?

(1) Much too high

(2) Too high

(3) About right

(4) Too low

(5) Much too low

(6) Don't know

Q28 I'm going to read out some things people have said about arts and culture and I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement, choosing your answer from this card.

Arts and cultural projects should not receive public funding

(1) Strongly agree

- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree
- (6) Don't know

Q29 I believe it is right that there should be public funding of arts and cultural projects.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree
- (6) Don't know

Q 30 I would feel out of place in an art gallery, museum or theatre.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree
- (6) Don't know

Q31 All schoolchildren should have the opportunity to learn to play a musical instrument or participate in other arts activities

- (1) Strongly agree

- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree
- (6) Don't know

Q32 Arts from different cultures contribute a lot to this country.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree
- (6) Don't know

Q33 The arts play a valuable role in my life.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree
- (6) Don't know

Q34 If my area lost its arts and cultural activities, the people living here would lose something of value.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree

(3) Neither agree nor disagree

(4) Disagree

(5) Strongly disagree

(6) Don't know

Q35 The arts play a valuable role in the life of the country.

(1) Strongly agree

(2) Agree

(3) Neither agree nor disagree

(4) Disagree

(5) Strongly disagree

(6) Don't know

Q36 Libraries provide a valuable service to their local community.

(1) Strongly agree

(2) Agree

(3) Neither agree nor disagree

(4) Disagree

(5) Strongly disagree

(6) Don't know

Q37 Do you have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity?

By long-standing I mean anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time.

(1) Yes

(2) No

Ask respondents who have a long-standing illness or disability

Q38 Does this illness or disability limit your activities in any way?

- . (1) Yes
- . (2) No

[July 2001 only]

Q39 A programme of national and regional events called the 'Year of the Artist' has just ended. How much do you know about this programme?

1. A great deal
2. A fair amount
3. A little
4. Heard of it, but know nothing about it
5. Never heard of it
6. Don't know

Question Set for the Omnibus Survey 2003-4

Q1 I am now going to ask you about some things that you may have done in your leisure time or for entertainment.

I would like you to look at this card and tell me which, if any, of these things you have visited or attended in the last 12 months.

Please include things like community events but exclude any events that you have attended as part of your job, or events produced by a school or sixth form college.

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) A film at a cinema or other venue
- (2) Public library
- (3) Museum/art gallery
- (4) Stately home/castle/garden
- (5) Well-known park or gardens
- (6) Exhibition or collection of art, photography or sculpture
- (7) Craft exhibition (not crafts markets)
- (8) Event including video or electronic art
- (9) Event connected with books or writing
- (10) None of these

Q2 And from this card, which, if any, of these things have you visited or attended in the last 12 months?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Carnival
- (2) Street arts or circus (not animals)
- (3) Culturally specific festival
- (4) Musical
- (5) Pantomime
- (6) Play/drama
- (7) Opera/operetta
- (8) Classical music concert
- (9) Jazz concert
- (10) Other live music event
- (11) Live dance event
- (12) None of these

Ask people who have attended a music event

Q3 What sort of music event was it?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Rock/pop
- (2) Folk or country and western
- (3) World music
- (4) Some other music

Ask people who have attended a live dance performance

Q4 What sort of dance event was it?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Ballet

(2) Contemporary dance

(3) Some other dance

Ask about all events listed in Qs 1–4

Q5 Thinking about the last 12 months, approximately how many times have you visited or attended this event?

Q6 And thinking about the last four weeks, have you visited or attended this event?

(1) Yes

(2) No

Ask all those who attended at least one arts event in the last 12 months

Q7 May I just check, what was the last event or place that you went to? Was it...

CODE FIRST THAT APPLIES

(1) the exhibition or collection of art, photography or sculpture?

(2) the craft exhibition?

(3) the event connected with books or writing?

(4) the carnival?

(5) the culturally specific festival?

(6) the musical or pantomime?

(7) the play or drama?

(8) the opera or operetta?

(9) the classical music concert?

(10) the jazz concert?

(11) the dance event?

(12) the event including video or electronic art?

Q8 What were your reasons for going to the event at Q7?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) See specific performer or event
- (2) Like going to that type of event
- (3) Special occasion/celebration
- (4) Social event
- (5) Invited to go
- (6) Recommended by a friend or relative
- (7) Accompanying children
- (8) Happened to be passing by
- (9) Other

Ask all those who gave more than one reason at Q8

Q9 May I just check, what was your main reason for going?

CODE ONE ONLY

- (1) See specific performer or event
- (2) Like going to that type of event
- (3) Special occasion/celebration
- (4) Social event
- (5) Invited to go
- (6) Recommended by a friend or relative
- (7) Accompanying children

(8) Happened to be passing by

(9) Other

Ask all respondents

Q10 Thinking about the arts and cultural events I've asked you about, if you could attend or visit them as often as you wanted, would you be interested in doing so (more than you do now)?

(1) Yes

(2) No

Q11 Here is a list of things which people say prevent them from visiting or attending (more) events. Looking at this card, could you tell me which, if any, apply to you?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

(1) It's difficult to find time

(2) It costs too much

(3) Family pressures

(4) I'm not really interested

(5) I don't have anyone to go with

(6) I might feel uncomfortable or out of place

(7) My health is not good enough

(8) Lack of transport

(9) Other

(10) None of these

Q12 I would like you to look at this card and tell me which, if any, of these

things you have done in the last 12 months.

Please include things like community events and festivals but exclude anything you have done as part of your job, or at school or sixth form college.

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Read for pleasure (not newspapers, magazines or comics)
- (2) Buy a novel, or book of stories, poetry or plays for yourself
- (3) Write any stories or plays
- (4) Write any poetry
- (5) None of these

Ask all those who read for pleasure

Q13 Can you tell me what sort of things you have read for pleasure over the last 12 months?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Work of fiction, play, novel or story
- (2) Poetry
- (3) Biography
- (4) Non-fiction/factual
- (5) Other

Ask all respondents

Q14 And from this card which, if any, of these things have you done in the last 12 months?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Clubbing

- (2) Do ballet
- (3) Dance for fitness, such as aerobics
- (4) Other dance
- (5) Sing to an audience or rehearse for a performance (not karaoke)
- (6) Play a musical instrument to an audience or rehearse for a performance
- (7) Play a musical instrument for your own pleasure
- (8) Write any music
- (9) Rehearse or perform in play/drama
- (10) Rehearse or perform in opera/operetta
- (11) Help with running of an arts/cultural event or arts organisation
- (12) None of these

Q15 And from this card which, if any, of these things you have done in the last 12 months?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Painting, drawing, printmaking or sculpture
- (2) Photography as an artistic activity (not family or holiday 'snaps')
- (3) Make films or videos as an artistic activity (not family or holidays)
- (4) Use a computer to create original artworks or animation
- (5) Textile crafts such as embroidery, crocheting or knitting
- (6) Wood crafts such as wood turning, carving or furniture making
- (7) Other crafts such as calligraphy, pottery or jewellery making
- (8) Buy any original works of art for yourself

(9) Buy any original/handmade crafts such as pottery or jewellery for yourself

(10) None of these

Ask about each activity mentioned at Qs 12,13,14–15, except buying art or craft, clubbing and dance for fitness

Q16 How often do you usually do [name of activity]?

(1) At least once a week

(2) At least once a month

(3) Every two or three months

(4) Two or three times a year

(5) Once a year

(6) Less than once a year

Ask all those who sang or played a musical instrument to an audience or played a musical instrument for pleasure

Q17 What type(s) of music do you sing/perform/play?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

(1) Classical including South Asian classical

(2) Choral

(3) Jazz

(4) Rock/pop

(5) World music

(6) Other

Ask all respondents

Q18 Now I'm going to ask you a couple of questions about participating in arts-related activities through classes or membership of clubs and groups.

Have you taken any classes or lessons during the last 12 months in any of the subjects on this card? Please include private tuition but exclude anything you have done as part of your job, at school or sixth form college, or as part of a higher education (degree) course.

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Music, singing or playing an instrument
- (2) Drama or dance
- (3) Creative writing
- (4) Photography or film making
- (5) Painting, drawing or other visual art (not arts appreciation)
- (6) Craft
- (7) Other art classes or lessons not mentioned above
- (8) None of these

Q19 In the last 12 months have you actively taken part in any of the following?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Choir or vocal group
- (2) Other music-making group
- (3) Drama, theatre or dance group
- (4) Writers' group
- (5) Photography or film making group

(6) Painting, drawing, printmaking or other visual arts group
(not arts appreciation)

(7) Other arts group

(8) None of these

Q20 I'm now going to ask you a few questions about watching and listening to arts events through television, radio and recordings such as CD or video.

Looking at this card, which, if any, have you listened to on CD, mini disc, tape or record during the last four weeks?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

(1) Rock/pop

(2) Classical music

(3) Opera/operetta

(4) Jazz

(5) World music

(6) Soul and dance music

(7) Poetry/book reading or performance

(8) A play

(9) None of these

Q21 Looking at this card, which, if any, have you listened to on the radio during the last four weeks?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

(1) Rock/pop

(2) Classical music

- (3) Opera/opera
- (4) Jazz
- (5) World music
- (6) Soul and dance music
- (7) Poetry/book reading or performance
- (8) A play
- (9) Asian radio stations
- (10) Black radio stations
- (11) None of these

Q22 Looking at this card, which, if any, have you watched on television, video or DVD during the last four weeks?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Rock/pop
- (2) Classical music
- (3) Opera/opera
- (4) Jazz
- (5) World music
- (6) Soul and dance music
- (7) Poetry/book reading or performance
- (8) A play
- (9) Dance
- (10) None of these

Q23 During the last 12 months have you used the internet to look at, watch,

or listen to any of the things on this card?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- (1) Works of visual art
- (2) Rock/pop
- (3) Classical music
- (4) Opera/operetta
- (5) Jazz
- (6) World music
- (7) Soul and dance music
- (8) Poetry or book reading
- (9) A play
- (10) Dance
- (11) None of these

Q24 During the last 12 months have you used the internet to find out about or order tickets for art exhibitions or live performances of music (not pop/rock), opera/operetta, book/poetry readings, plays or dance?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

Q25 I would now like to ask you about your opinions about different aspects of the arts and culture.

Looking at this card, which of the statements best describes the availability of facilities and activities such as theatres, museums, concerts and exhibitions to people living in your local area?

- (1) Almost all of these activities/facilities are available locally
- (2) Some of these activities/facilities are available locally
- (3) These activities/facilities are not available locally but I can get to them fairly easily
- (4) These activities/facilities are not within easy reach

Q26 Do you think the amount of public money spent on arts and cultural events and activities that are within your area is too high, about right or too low?

- (1) Much too high
- (2) Too high
- (3) About right
- (4) Too low
- (5) Much too low
- (6) Don't know

Q27 Now thinking about the country as a whole, do you think the amount of public money spent on arts and cultural events and activities in this country as a whole is too high, about right or too low?

- (1) Much too high
- (2) Too high
- (3) About right
- (4) Too low
- (5) Much too low
- (6) Don't know

Q28 I'm going to read out some things people have said about arts and culture

and I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement, choosing your answer from this card.

I believe it is right that there should be public funding of arts and cultural projects.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree
- (6) Don't know

Q29 I would feel out of place in an art gallery, museum or theatre.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree
- (6) Don't know

Q30 All schoolchildren should have the opportunity to learn to play a musical instrument or participate in other arts activities

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Disagree

(5) Strongly disagree

(6) Don't know

Q31 Arts from different cultures contribute a lot to this country.

(1) Strongly agree

(2) Agree

(3) Neither agree nor disagree

(4) Disagree

(5) Strongly disagree

(6) Don't know

Q32 The arts play a valuable role in my life.

(1) Strongly agree

(2) Agree

(3) Neither agree nor disagree

(4) Disagree

(5) Strongly disagree

(6) Don't know

Q33 If my area lost its arts and cultural activities, the people living here would lose something of value.

(1) Strongly agree

(2) Agree

(3) Neither agree nor disagree

(4) Disagree

(5) Strongly disagree

(6) Don't know

Q34 The arts play a valuable role in the life of the country.

(1) Strongly agree

(2) Agree

(3) Neither agree nor disagree

(4) Disagree

(5) Strongly disagree

(6) Don't know

Q35 Libraries provide a valuable service to their local community.

(1) Strongly agree

(2) Agree

(3) Neither agree nor disagree

(4) Disagree

(5) Strongly disagree

(6) Don't know

Q36 I am now going to ask you about a different area. How is your health in general? Would you say it was...

(1) very good

(2) good

(3) fair

(4) bad

(5) or very bad

Q37 May I just check, do you have any long-standing illness, disability or

infirmity?

By long-standing I mean anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time.

(1) Yes

(2) No

Ask respondents who have a long-standing illness or disability

Q38 Does this illness or disability limit your activities in any way?

(1) Yes

(2) No

Bibliography

Arnold, M., & Collini, S. (1993). *Culture and anarchy: And other writings* (Cambridge texts in the history of political thought). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Arts Council of England (1994-2007) *Annual Report and Accounts*, London, Arts Council of England.

Arts Council of England (1999) *Memorandum Submitted by the Arts Council of England: Arm's Length Principle/Delivering DCMS Objectives* (downloaded from <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm199899/cmselect/cmcomeds/506/9062402.htm>).

Arts Council of England (2000) *Artstat: Digest of Arts Statistics and Trends in the UK 1986/87- 1997/98* London, Arts Council of England.

Arts Council England (2003): *Ambitions for the Arts* London, Arts Council England.

Arts Council England (2004): *The Impact of the Arts - Some Research Evidence*. London, Arts Council England.

Arts Council England (2010): *Achieving Great Art for Everyone* London, Arts Council England.

Arts Council of Great Britain (1946-1994) *Annual Report and Accounts* London, Arts Council of Great Britain.

Arts Council of Great Britain (1974) *Community Arts, The Report of the*

Community Arts Working Party June 1974, Arts Council of Great Britain.

Arts Council of Great Britain (1984) *The Glory of the Garden: The Development of the Arts in England* London, Arts Council of Great Britain.

Arts Professional (2011) No Change: six years of audience development work has not upped engagement levels Arts Professional 235, accessed at <http://www.artsprofessional.co.uk/Magazine/view.cfm?id=5588&issue=235>.

Bakhshi, H., Freeman, A., Hitchen, G., (2009) *Measuring Intrinsic Value: How to stop worrying and love economics*. Mission, Money, Models.

Barker, C., and Jane, E.A. (2016) *Cultural Studies theory and practice* 5th edition Sage, London.

Baumol, W., & Bowen, W. (1966). *Performing arts - the economic dilemma: A study of problems common to theater, opera, music and dance* M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Belfiore, E. (2007) Auditing Culture, *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10:2, 183-202.

Belfiore, E., and Bennett, O. (2007) Rethinking the Social Impact of Culture, *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13 (2) pp. 135-150.

Belfiore, E., and Bennett, O. (2008) *The Social Impact of the Arts* Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Bell. D. And Oakley, K. (2015) *Cultural Policy* Routledge, London.

Bennett, O. (1991) 'British cultural policies 1970-1990'. In: *Boekmancahier*, jrg. 3, nr. 9, 293- 301.

Bennett, O. (2004) The Torn Halves of Cultural Policy Research, *International*

Journal of Cultural Policy 10 (2) pp. 237-248.

Bennett, O. (2005) 'Beyond Machinery: The cultural policies of Matthew Arnold' in *History of Political Economy*, vol 37, no. 3, pp 455-82.

Bennett, O. (2006) 'Intellectuals, Romantics and cultural policy', in *International Journal of Cultural Policy: Special Issue - Intellectuals and Cultural Policy*, Part 1, vol 12, no. 1, pp 117-34.

Bennett, T (1992) Putting Policy into Cultural Studies, in Grossberg, L., Nelson, C., Treichler, P. eds (1992) *Cultural Studies* Routledge, London.

Bennett, T (1998) *Culture A Reformer's Science* Sage, London.

Bennett, T (2003) Culture and Governmentality in Bratich, J., Packer, J. and McCarthy, C. eds (2003) *Foucault, Cultural Studies and Governmentality* State University of New York Press, Albany.

Bennett, T (2005), *Civic Laboratories: museums, cultural objecthood and the governance of the social*. CRESC working papers 52, Open University, Milton Keynes.

Bennett, T (2007) The Work of Culture, *Cultural Sociology* vol 1 (1) pp. 31-47.

Bennett, T. (2011) 'Guided Freedom: Aesthetics, Tutelage, and the Interpretation of Art ', Tate Papers, no.15, Spring 2011, <http://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/tate-papers/15/guided-freedom-aesthetics-tutelage-and-the-interpretation-of-art>, accessed 16 February 2018.

Bennett, T. (2014). A Thorn in the Side: Ian Hunter, Cultural Studies, and the Humanities. *History of European Ideas*, 40(1), 82–88. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2013.784036>.

Bennett, T., Savage, M., Silva, E., Warde, A., Gayo-Cal, M., and Wright, D. (2009) *Culture, Class, Distinction* Routledge, London.

Bentham, J. (1962) *The Works of Jeremy Bentham* Russell and Russell, New York.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* Routledge, London.

Bratich, J., Packer, J. and McCarthy, C. eds (2003) *Foucault, Cultural Studies and Governmentality* State University of New York Press, Albany.

Bridgwood, A and Skelton, A. (2000) The Arts in England: developing a survey of attendance, participation and attitudes *Cultural Trends* 40 49-76.

Burchill, G., Gordon, C., and Miller, P. (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Callon, M. (1998) Introduction: the embeddedness of economic markets in economics in M. Callon (ed.) *The Laws of the Markets* Blackwell, Oxford.

Callon, M (1999) Actor network theory – the market test, in Law, J and Hassard, J. (eds) *Actor Network Theory and After* Blackwell, Oxford.

Campbell, P., Cox, T., and O'Brien, D. (2017) The Social Life of Measurement: how methods have shaped the idea of culture in urban regeneration, *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 10:1, 49-62.

CASE working paper 8 *Understanding and measuring the value of engaging in sport and culture*.

Chan, T.W., Goldthorpe, J.H., 2005. The social stratification of theatre, dance and cinema attendance. *Cultural Trends* 14 (3), 193–212.

- Chan, T.W., Goldthorpe, J.H., 2007a. Social stratification and cultural consumption: music in England. *European Sociological Review* 23 (1), 1–29.
- Chan, T.W., Goldthorpe, J.H., 2007b. Class and status: the conceptual distinction and its empirical relevance. *American Sociological Review* 72 (4), 512–532.
- Chan, T.W., Goldthorpe, J.H., 2007c. Social stratification and cultural consumption: The visual arts in England *Poetics* 35 (2007) 168–190.
- CLG (Communities and Local Government (2006) *Strong and Prosperous Communities, the Local Government white paper* HMSO, London.
- CLG (Communities and Local Government) (2008) *National Indicators for Local Authorities and Local Authority Partnerships: Handbook of Definitions* HMSO, London.
- Coleridge, S.T. (1839) *On the Constitution of Church and State*. William Pickering, London.
- Connell, K., and Hilton, M eds (2016) *Cultural Studies 50 Years On* Rowman and Littlefield, London.
- Cooper, M., & Mcfall, L. (2017). *Ten years after: It's the economy and culture, stupid!* *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 10(1), 1-7.
- Corbin, T. (2001) Using the Omnibus Survey to pilot the Arts Council of England's survey on arts attendance, participation and attitudes *Social Survey Methodology Bulletin*, ONS, London.
- DCMS (2001): Building on PAT 10, DCMS, London.
- DCMS (2003a): Strategic Plan 2003-2006, DCMS, London.
- DCMS (2003b) A Research Strategy 2003-6, DCMS, London.

DCMS (2009) National Indicators 8, 9, 10 and 11: Interim progress Statistical Release 17 December 2009, DCMS, London.

DCMS (2011): Taking Part: the National Survey of Culture, Leisure and Sport, statistical release Jan-Dec 2010. Accessed at http://www.dcms.gov.uk/images/research/Taking_Part_Y6_Q3_Jan-Dec10.pdf.

Dean, M. (1994) *Critical and Effective Histories: Foucault's Methods and historical sociology*, Routledge, London.

Dempsey, N. (2016) *Art Funding: Statistics* House of Commons Briefing Paper number CBP 7655.

De Nora, T. (2000) *Music in Everyday Life* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Desrosieres, A. (1998) *The Politics of Large Numbers: A History of Statistical Reasoning* Harvard University Press, London.

DuGay, P. and Pryke, M.eds. (2002) *Cultural Economy cultural analysis and commercial life* Sage, London.

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION (2013). *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 6(3), 227–228. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2013.808078>.

Entwistle, J and Slater, D (2013): Reassembling the Cultural: Fashion models, brands and the meaning of 'culture' after ANT, *Journal of Cultural Economy* vol 7 (2) pp.161-177.

Fenn, C (et al) (2004) *Arts in England 2003 attendance, participation and attitudes* Research Report 37 Arts Council England, London.

Finnegan, R. (2007) *The Hidden Musicians Music-Making in an English Town*

Wesleyan University Press, Middletown.

Foucault, M. (1971/1991) Nietzsche, Genealogy, History (trans) in Rabinow ed. (1991) *The Foucault Reader* Penguin, London.

Foucault, M. (1981) "Questions of Method: an interview" in *Ideology and Consciousness* 8 Power and Desires: Diagrams of the Social
Foucault, M (2002) *The Archaeology of Knowledge* Routledge, London.

Fox, K., Rickards, L., UK Statistics Authority, & Great Britain. Office for National Statistics. (2004). *Sport and leisure: Results from the sport and leisure module of the 2002 General household survey*. TSO, London.

Frey, B (2008) What Values Should Count in the Arts? The Tension between Economics Effects and Cultural Value in Hutter and Throsby, eds (2008) *Beyond Price: Value in Culture, Economics, and the Arts* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gibson, L. (2008) Defence of Instrumentality, *Cultural Trends* vol 17 (4) pp.247-257.

Ginsburgh, V.A., and Throsby, D., eds (2006) *Handbook of the economics of art and culture* volume 1 Elsevier North Holland.

Goodwin, C., (2006) Art and Culture in the History of Economic Thought in
Ginsburgh, V.A., and Throsby, D., eds (2006) *Handbook of the economics of art and culture* volume 1 Elsevier North Holland.

Gray, C. (2000) *The Politics of the Arts in Britain*, Macmillan, London.

Gray, C. (2010) Analysing cultural policy: incorrigibly plural or ontologically incompatible? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 16(2), 215–230.

Grossberg, L., Nelson, C., Treichler, P. eds (1992) *Cultural Studies* Routledge, London.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hacking, I. (1992) 'The Self-Vindication of the laboratory sciences' in Pickering, A. (ed) *Science as practice and culture*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Hall, S. (1980). Cultural studies: Two paradigms. *Media, Culture & Society*, 2(1), 57-72.

Hall, S. (1992) Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies, in Grossberg, L., Nelson, C., Treichler, P. eds (1992) *Cultural Studies* Routledge, London.

Hall, S. (1996) Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity' in Morley, D and Chen, D (eds) *Stuart Hall* Routledge, London.

Hall, S., ed (1997), *Representation: Cultural Representations and signifying practices*, Sage, London.

Hall, S. 2016, eds. Slack, Jennifer Darryl, Grossberg Lawrence: *Cultural Studies 1983 A Theoretical History*, Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Haraway, D. (1997) *Modest Witness@Second Millennium.FemaleMan _Meets_ OncoMouse: Feminism and Technoscience* Routledge, London.

HM Treasury (2003) *The Green Book - Appraisal and Valuation in Central Government* HMSO, London.

Hewitt, R. (2010) *Map of a Nation: A Biography of the Ordnance Survey*, Granta, London.

- Hill, L. (2007) *The Cambridge Introduction to Jacques Derrida* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hoare, G., and Sperber, N. (2016) *An Introduction to Antonio Gramsci His Life Thought and Legacy* Bloomsbury, London.
- Holden, J. (2004) *Capturing Cultural Value* Demos, London.
- Hunter, I. (1992) Aesthetics and Cultural Studies, in Grossberg, L., Nelson, C., Treichler, P. eds (1992) *Cultural Studies* Routledge, London.
- Hutchison, R. (1982) *The Politics of the Arts Council* Sinclair Browne, London.
- Hutter and Throsby, eds (2008) *Beyond Price: Value in Culture, Economics, and the Arts* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hutton, L., Bridgwood, A., & Dust, K. (2010) Research at Arts Council England, *Cultural Trends*, 13:4, 41-64.
- Jermyn, H., and Desai, P. (2000) *Arts, what's in a word: ethnic minorities and the arts* Arts Council of England, London.
- Jermyn, H., Skelton, A., Bridgwood, A., & Arts Council of England. (2001). *Arts in England: Attendance, participation & attitudes* (ACE research report 22) Arts Council of England, London.
- Jowell, T. (2004) *Government and the Value of Culture* DCMS, London.
- Kelly, O. (1984, digital ed 2016) *Community Art and the State: storming the citadels* Comedia, London.
- Kendall, G. and Wickham, G. (1999) *Using Foucault's Methods* Sage, London.
- Knights, B. (1978) *The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Latour, B (2007) *Reassembling the social: An introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Law, J. (2004a) *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research* Routledge, London.

Law, J. (2004b) 'And if the Global Were Small and Non-Coherent? Method, Complexity and the Baroque', *Society and Space* 22: 13–26. Also available at: <http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/law-and-if-the-global-were-small.pdf>.

Law, J. (2009) Seeing Like a Survey *Cultural Sociology* vol 3 (2) pp. 239-256.

Law, J. and Hassard, J. Eds (1999) *Actor Network Theory and After* Blackwell, Oxford.

Law, J. and Mol, A. Eds (2002) *Complexities: Social Studies of Knowledge Practices* Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Law, J. and Ruppert, E. (2013) The Social Life of Methods: *Devices*, *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 6:3, 229-240.

Law, J. and Urry, J. (2004) Enacting the Social *Economy and Society* Volume 33 Number 3 August 2004: 390–410.

Law, J., Ruppert, E., and Savage, M. (2011) *The Double Social Life of Methods* CRESC, working paper 95.

Lewis, J and Miller T. eds (2003) *Critical Cultural Policy Studies* Blackwell, Oxford.

Martin, V., Bunting, C., and Oskala, A. (2010) *Arts Engagement in England 2008/09 Findings from the Taking Part Survey* Arts Council England, London.

McGuigan, J (1996) *Culture and the Public Sphere* Routledge, London.

- McGuigan, J. (2004) *Rethinking Cultural Policy* Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
- McMaster, B. (2008) *Supporting Excellence in the Arts: From Measurement to Judgement* DCMS, London.
- Miller P. and Rose N. (1990) Governing Economic Life *Economy and Society*, 19 (1):1-31.
- Mol, A (1999) Ontological politics. A word and some questions *The Sociological Review* vol 47 p74-89.
- Morley, D and Chen D. (Eds) (1996) *Stuart Hall* Routledge, London.
- National Arts Media Strategy Monitoring Group (1992). *Towards a national arts and media strategy*. National Arts and Media Strategy Monitoring Group, London.
- O'Brien, D. (2010) *Measuring the value of culture: a report to the department of culture, media and sport*. DCMS, London.
- O'Brien, D. (2014) *Cultural Policy, Management, Value and Modernity in the Creative Industries* Routledge, London.
- O'Brien, D. (2015) What Price Evidence? The Ethics of office and the ethics of social science in British cultural Policy, *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 9:2, 127-140.
- O'Brien, D., & Miles, S. (2010). Cultural policy as rhetoric and reality: a comparative analysis of policy making in the peripheral north of England. *Cultural Trends*, 19(1-2), 3–13.
- Peacock, A., (2006) The Arts and Economic Policy in Ginsburgh, V.A., and

Throsby, D., eds (2006) *Handbook of the economics of art and culture* volume 1
Elsevier North Holland.

Pick, J. (1991) *Vile Jelly, the Birth, Life and Lingered Death of the Arts Council
of Great Britain*, Brynmill, Doncaster.

Pinnock, A. (2008) Two Cultures: the use and non-use of hypotheses in cultural
policy research *Cultural Trends* 17 (3) pp. 139-146.

Porter, T. (1995) *Trust in Numbers*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Rabinow, P ed. (1991) *The Foucault Effect* Penguin, London.

Reeves, M., & Arts Council of England. (2002). *Measuring the economic and
social impact of the arts: A review* (ACE research report; 24). Arts Council of
England, London.

Saisselin, R.G. (1970) 'The transformation of art into culture: From Pascal to
Diderot' in Besterman, T. 9(ed) *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*,
Institute et Musee Voltaire, Geneve.

Saussure, F., & Harris, R. (2013). *Course in general linguistics* (translated and
annotated by Roy Harris) Bloomsbury Academic, London.

Savage, M. (2010). *Identities and Social Change in Britain since 1940: The
Politics of Method*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Scullion, A., and Garcia, B. (2005) What is Cultural Policy Research *International
Journal of Cultural Policy* 11 (1) pp. 113-127.

Selwood, S. (2002). The politics of data collection: Gathering, analysing and
using data about the subsidised cultural sector in England. *Cultural Trends*,
12(47), 13-84.

- Selwood, S. (2006) A Part to Play? The academic contribution to the development of cultural policy in England *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 12 (1) pp. 35-49.
- Selwood (2017) Multiple Perspectives on Culture Counts *Cultural Trends*, 2017 26 (4) 312–327 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2017.1382766>.
- Shaw, P. (1999) *The Arts and Neighbourhood Renewal, A Literature Review to inform the work of Policy Action Team 10*, DCMS 1999.
- Sinclair, A. (1995) *Arts and Culture: the history of the 50 years of the Arts Council of Great Britain* Sinclair-Stevenson, London.
- Skelton, A. et al (2002), *Arts in England: attendance, participation and attitudes in 2001*. Arts Council of England, London.
- Smith, A. (1766/1976) *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Smith, C. (1998) *Creative Britain* Faber and Faber, London.
- Stevens, A. (2010). Telling Policy Stories: An Ethnographic Study of the Use of Evidence in Policy-making in the UK. *Journal of Social Policy*, 40(02), 237–255. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279410000723>.
- White, E.W. (1975) *The Arts Council of Great Britain* Davis-Poynter, London.
- Williams, R. (1958) *Culture and Society 1780-1950*, Chatto and Windus, London.
- Woolf, S. (1989). Statistics and the Modern State. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 31(3), 588-604.
- Upchurch, A (2004) John Maynard Keynes, the Bloomsbury group and the origins of the arts council movement, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*,

10:2, 203-217.

Upchurch, A., (2016) *The Origins of the Arts Council Movement: Philanthropy and Policy* Palgrave Macmillan, London.